Karthigesu Sivathamby

LITERARY HISTORY IN TAMIL

[a historiographical analysis]

TAMIL UNIVERSITY
THANJAVUR-613 001

பேராசிரியர் முனைவர் **இரா. இளவரசு**

நூலக நூல்கள்

நூற்கொடை : பேராசிரியர் **இரா. வேலம்மாள்**

பேராசிரியர் இளவரசு நினைவு அறக்கட்டளை

LITERARY HISTORY IN TAMIL

[a historiographical analysis]

KARTHIGESU SIVATHAMBY,
M.A. (SriL)., Ph.D (Birm).,
Professor of Tamil,
Head, Dept. of Fine Arts,
University of Jaffna,
Jaffna, Sri Lanka.

TAMIL UNIVERSITY
THANJAVUR
INDIA

Tamil University
Publication No. : **68**
Thiruvalluvar Year 2017 Ayppasi - October 1986
Title : **Literary History in Tamil**
Author : **Karthigesu Sivathamby**
Price : **Rs. 60-00**
$ 12
Edition : First-1986
Press : Tamil University Offset Press,
Thanjavur - 613 001.

CONTENTS

Introduction i

CHAPTER

I A Brief Introduction to the Discipline and its Perspectives 1

II The Role of Literary History in Tamil 21

III The Problematics of Tamil Literary History 89

IV Viewing Tamil Literary Development -- Problems of Periodisation 107

Epilogue 133

Notes and References 137

Appendices 161

Index 195

INTRODUCTION

The four major topics that constitute this publication were originally read as papers at a seminar held at the Tamil University, Thanjavur (August 7 & 8, 1982) in fulfilment of the assignment I had there as a visiting research fellow.

As a University teacher engaged in both teaching at undergraduate level and supervision at postgraduate level, I have often felt the need to go into the historiography of Tamil Literature and the periodization done in that history, for I felt that some of the attitudes like glorifying the past, equating literary quality with dynastic-eminences, which forbid the students from having a comprehensive view of the socio-literary developments in Tamil, lay deeply embedded in the ideology that underlies the periodization. The imposition of the notion that the literary expression of a community is best understood in relation to the rulers of that community and the dynasties to which they belonged could lead and has led to literary deductions which run counter to verifiable truths relating to the genesis and social relevance of literature.

As one interested in the social history of the Tamils, it was becoming increasingly difficult for me to accept

the theoretical position that periodization in the literary history of a community could differ from the periodization it has for its socio-political developments.

Also, I found it necessary to understand fully the socio-cultural reasons for the invocation of the literary culture of the Tamils, especially its antiquity, its uniqueness in terms of Sanskrit, by political movements. It is a well-known fact that right from the days of the Tanittamil movement to the present days of DMK and ADMK, the importance of the literary culture of the Tamils as something constituting their uniqueness within Indian culture has been one of the important themes of 'research' by Tamil scholars.

Besides these, there is also the intellectual and academic need to delineate Tamil literary development as a social process, the socio-aesthetic demands made of literature, its socio-aesthetic foundations, the social condition of the literary practitioners their role (or lack of it) in the general mode of production, the ideological role of literature etc.

It was at that stage of enquiry, trying to understand the history of the Tamils in terms of their literature, that I found that a sharp distinction has to be made between history of literature and literary history, a concept quite familiar in western literary studies but not so in Tamil. The need for an author like Flaceliere (A literary history of Greece) in Tamil cannot be overstated.

It is true that very often the terms of "history of literature" and "literary history" are used interchangeably. But I feel it quite essential to differentiate between the two. "History of literature" would deal with the development of literature in society, as for instance, history of science in society. Literary history, has to deal with the history of a community in terms of its literature. What we need in the context of Tamil

studies is a literary history of Tamil. But that cannot be achieved without a history of Tamil Literature.

It would be quite unthinkable to complete work on a study like that within six months. I, therefore, decided that, as a preliminary to a major study on the literary history of Tamil, I would take up just the historiographical aspect for analysis during my stay at Thanjavur.

With a congenial academic climate (which unfortunately cannot be said of the geographical climate, especially during April-July 1982) and the release from administrative burdens that tie down many a university intellectual, I found the going at Thanjavur very stimulating. With the interest shown by fellow academics and the keenness evinced by the Vice-Chancellor himself, I was able to concentrate on the work with great intellectual satisfaction.

My desire to elicit the response of those scholars who had done and are doing work in history of Tamil Literature, to this attempt at viewing literature in terms of its society-forming character, when expressed to the Vice-Chancellor, met with a ready-response to hold a seminar. The Vice-Chancellor's interest in the project was such that the Directors of Tamil Promotion and of Planning and Development Programmes of the Tamil University were requested to organize the seminar.

Ten scholars - M.Shanmughampillai, N.Subramaniam, K.T.Thirunavukkarasu, G.Arunachalakkounder, P.Thirugnanasambandam, P.Arunachalam, M.Arunachalam, Y.Subbarayalu and G.Kesavan whose works in the field of ancient history and history of literature are well-known were invited and five scholars from the Tamil University, K.Vellaivaranar, Sundara Shanmuganar, and M.Shanmugampillai along with T.Murugaratnam and Rm.Sundaram, the Directors of the promotional activities of the Tamil University, also took part.

It was an "arangetram" in more than one sense, for not only the idea of one scholar testing out his views with an expert audience (as was stated by Prof. V.I.Subramoniam) was new, but this was the first time there ever was a serious discussion at a University forum in Tamilnadu on the application of the methodology of historical materialism to Tamilian literary history. The epilogue to the book deals in brief with the problems raised and the discussions that ensued.

The four chapters, as they stand now, constitute a prolegomena to the study of literary history of Tamil. The first paper defines the term literary history, delineates its relationship to history and deals with the academic function of literary history as a discipline associated with social history. The role of literature in social formation is explained thereby emphasizing the need for a study of literature to understand the social formation. The second chapter deals with the rise of literary history in Tamil. The phases of development in literary history have been determined primarily on the basis of the character of literary communication (print era; pre-print and post-print eras; the significance in terms of literary formation). An attempt has been made to locate the historical times when there was consciousness about the literary heritage, thus analysis of the compilation of Çankam poems and the codification of bhakthi hymns. The third chapter deals with the problematics of literary history indicating what have been left out in the various histories of literature and what would constitute a comprehensive literary history. The fourth chapter deals with the much contested question of periodization. The periodization given here is based on the concept of social formation.

Those familiar with Tamil historical studies will know the inadequacy of historical research in Tamil dealing with social and economic formations. So any effort to trace literary history on the basis of the dominant social formation should necessarily await

the completion of studies in history proper. But for the pioneering work done by Karashima, Subbarayalu and Narayanan the wait would be a long one. At a juncture like this an analysis from the standpoint of the literary sources might be of some assistance. The fourth chapter also deals with historio-geographical problem of a more fundamental type viz., the question of finding out the exact character of the influence the dominant mode of production exerted during the period from about 600 A.D to about 1400 A.D. I am very much aware of the inadequate manner the pre-600 era is discussed here. In a work like this in which we are dealing with theoretical problems of this type for the first time in Tamil literary history, it is not possible to deal with every aspect at length. It should however be remembered that unless the basic problem of periodization is sufficiently discussed it would not be possible to go in for a social history.

Coming to the very pleasant task of acknowledging, expressing my indebtedness to those who helped me to complete this work, I should refer to the Vice-Chancellor of the Tamil University for the Fellowship and for the keen interest he took in my work. I am beholden to him for the very useful discussion I had with him on many questions dealing with literary history in Tamil.

Vidwan M.Shanmugampillai and Dr. Venkatesh Atreya helped me with discussions. The discussions I had with Prof. Romila Thapar on those problems discussed in the fourth chapter, helped me immensely to get a clearer view of the many implications of the discussion on the Asiatic mode. I am thankful to her for those discussions and am sorry that I was not able to deal with them fully in this book. I am thankful to Dr. Y.Subbarayalu for providing some of his yet unpublished chapters for reference and for discussing some of the problems connected with the Cola polity.

I wish to thank the librarians of the Tamil University, the Annamalai University, the University of Madras, the Maraimalai Atikal Memorial Library, the British Council, Madras and the Karantai Pulavar College, Thanjavur for readily helping me with books. I am thankful to the Director of the French Institute of Indology for making arrangement for my stay at Pondicherry and enabling me to use the library. I am much obliged to Sri T.N.Ramachandran of Thanjavur for helping me with a number of rare books.

I wish to thank Drs. T.Murugaratnam and Rm.Sundaram for the commitment with which they organized and conducted the seminar.

Thiru C.S.Chellappan, acting Registrar and Director of Publications showed great interest in the publication of this work. I am very thankful to him.

I owe a lot to Thiru A.Marx for the fraternal manner he helped me during my stay at Thanjavur. But for him the chapters would not have been ready in time for the seminar. He corrected the type script and helped to prepare the appendices. I thank him most sincerely for his help and assistance.

Thiru B.Velsamy, friend of the former and now also mine, helped me to think more deeply on some of the problems of literary history with very stimulating questions. I thank him for those questions.

I wish to thank Sri V.Udhaya Kumar who did the typing and stencil cutting for the seminar and Sri B.Jambulingam and Kumari T.Vimala Christopel for typing the revised draft.

I had undertaken this study during the first half of my sabbatical leave (April - Obtober) and I found it most difficult to be away from my wife and children. I missed them much. Looking back at it now, I think

it was perhaps due to the fact that I wished to get back to them early that I did such intensive work at such a short time.

I recall with immense paternal satisfaction the encouragement my daughters Krithika and Dharini gave me in their letters. I also recall with immense pleasure the scribblings I had from my last daughter Vardhani.

Having left all the cares of running a home to a dutiful wife, it was easy for me to work as intensively as was possible at Thanjavur.

I dedicate this book to Vimala as a token of my willing dependence.

Thanjavur,
30-9-1982. **KARTHIGESU SIVATHAMBY**

POST-SCRIPT

I am glad to see the work now ready for publication. I am beholden to the Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Director of Publications for it.

Going through the final proofs, I do not fail to see the discrepancy in the transliterations. Both forms of transliteration -- the common manner Tamil names are written in English and the manner the Tamil Lexicon would have them -- have been used, the latter without the phonetic markers. As the work is going to be used largely by those who are already familiar with the names, I do hope this discrepancy would not be too much of a repulsive factor.

Thiru Kovai. Ilancheran, Deputy Director of Publications has put me under great obligation to him. He took a personal interest in speeding the work on the

book. My thanks are due to his assistant, Thiru M.Balakrishnan for his assistance during the final stages.

Once again, Marx and Chidambaram, helped me through the final proofs and the index. I thank them for it.

I am obliged to Prof. Y.Subbarayalu for the keen interest he took in this work.

Thiru D.Balasubramanian and Thirumathy A.Jacquline Mary Margaret did the electronic typing. I thank them for their swift and clear work.

Valvettiturai,
Sri Lanka,
15-10-1986.

KARTHIGESU SIVATHAMBY

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE DISCIPLINE AND ITS PERSPECTIVES

What is 'literary history' and why is it essential?

Is there any difference between a literary history of a language or a country, and history of its literature?

These are some of the more important theoretical questions that would crop up when we deal with Tamil Literature and its history. In the history of Tamil literary scholarship, the concept of a history of literature or of literary history is seen to operate very late, so late that it cannot, in the sense the discipline is understood today, go beyond the latter half of the last century. The term we have in Tamil *Ilakkiya Varalaru* (*இலக்கிய வரலாறு*) is a recent addition to the vocabulary of literary scholarship. This elliptical compound form does not clearly indicate whether it is history of literature (*இலக்கியத்தின் வரலாறு*) or history in terms of literature (*இலக்கியவழி வரலாறு*).

It is important to have a clear concept of the area of study; the terms 'history of literature' and

'literary history' are very often used interchangeably but, considering them more closely, we would see that the two could, in fact, be studies relating to two different things. One could study literature (in society) as one studies religion or games, or any institutions, that is, there can be the study of the history of literature, how it began, how it developed, how the various literary forms developed etc., but, this type of study could be different from studying the history of a country of community *in terms* of its literature. The history of a country in terms of politics or to be exact political developments would be the political history, the history of a country in terms of the mechanisms of rule and governance, authority and power, that is in terms of its constitution would be constitutional history. Likewise, the history of a country in terms of its economic resources and activities, its production, distribution and consumption would be the economic history of that country. In the same manner, the history of a country or of a community in term of its literature, what are discussed in it and not discussed in it, how selectively and why so and in terms of its literary production, distribution and consumption could be the literary history of that country or community.

This would imply that a history of literature, with its limited scope of the development of literature, its forms etc., and a literary history with its emphasis in the historical development of the community as seen through literature could be two different things. In such a situation a good history of literature is a pre-requisite for an adequate literary history.

The question that confronts us is, which of the two is intellectual need of the day in Tamil studies. The problem has to be analysed further. It could be argued on the basis of the foregoing analysis that by 'literary history' something more than the development of 'literature' is being aimed at. That could lead to

ideological disputes concerning the need and the limits of literary history. Let us put the question in a slightly different manner, 'Why do we need a history of literature?' Why not take the entire literary input as 'a simultaneous order' and study it in that manner?

It is at this point there should be a clarity about the basic intellectual premises. Any dispute thereafter would be on the choice of the premise and not relating to the intellectual conviction that leads on those premises.

Thus, at the outset, the question of what is literature or what, in the view of this study, is to be taken as literature, becomes vital to the whole discussion. In a study like this, which calls for a comprehensive view of literature, of history and of their interaction, one cannot take up epigrammatic definitions and interpret them. The position has to be explicated. It really is an argument and it could be stated thus.

As we get on to 'define' literature for purposes of history, whether its own history or *general* history, we should be able to, at the outset describe literature in terms of its function and in terms of its 'working' as a process. David Craig's description of the literary process could be an apt beginning.

> "The deepest--rooted forces acting in history--that is, the struggle between sections of society for the means of life--transforms the way of life, that is, people's relations as they work together to subsist (which includes psychological well-being, sexual satisfaction, as well as food, clothing and shelter). This transforming gives rise to new networks of communication (oral performance for a one--class audience, commodity circulation of printed work for a mixed public, or whatever). Out of this arises literature, the expression in words (often closely

fused with music and graphics) of the new, pressing life-concerns of peoples in a particular place and time (concerns that overlap to a degree with the life of our species in all its places and times). And this expression is in styles that adapt in a personal way according to the innate and conditioned natures of the individual artists and artistes--the media available in the community at the time" [1]

In this fairly well-formulated 'origin-development-characteristics' of literature, Craig highlights the communicational character of literature, its deep-rooted concern with the question of the 'humanness' in the 'act' of living that really arises out of the social relationship available during that period and its individuality in terms of its production, especially the author who produces it.

It is important to highlight the fact, that of the human innovations, nothing surpasses literature in the range of its appeal in defining humanity; so the value of literature should be sought in the knowledge it provides on the human character of man. L.C.Knights expresses this idea thus:

"If I were forced to make a short summary statement of the function of literature--say in answer to an engineering scientist who could honestly see no difference between poetry and push-pin (different pleasures for different people). I should claim that literature is a form of knowledge, an irreplaceable way of arriving at truths that are of the highest importance to us if we are to remain, or try to become adequately human. But why 'irreplaceable'? There are two answers. One is that the truths in question are difficult to come at, not only because of 'the veil of familiarity' that gets between us and the actuality of our world, but because we have to penetrate subtle defences. As Camus said of Doestoevsky, he teaches us not only what we

know but what we refuse to recognize, as Melville said of Shakespeare, "All that we seek and *shun* is there". The other is that truth, in this context is not something that we receive or acquire by logical demonstration, but something that we live our way into through a complex, varying activity when we engage in the formal structures of a particular kind". [2]

If literature is an irreplaceable form of knowledge to arrive at truths that ensure our being adequately human, then a chronological review of it should enable us to identify those efforts in time which had argued for and helped to maintain that "humanness".

So, instead of the usual, much-too-condemned process of coming to literature through the theory of 'reflection' (literature as mirror reflecting the images of life), it is also possible to reach centrifugally from the matrix of literature to humanity at large.

"Man, as understood in the social sense, not in the anthropological, as an individual created by the entire social and spiritual life--such is the core of that shapes in equal measure both form and content in literature. That is why literature belongs to the sphere of sociological analysis".

"Literary works reveal social man, with all the variety of his spiritual life, the contradictions between his emotions and thoughts, his relation with society, and in his inner life and outward behaviour. *From here we derive the links between the individual and the historical conditions of his life, the historical perspective that characterise the social atmosphere, the struggle of ideas, the social clashes; involvement in all these determines the fullness of his individuality, an involvement that is inseparable in principle form the specific mode of artistic condition".* [3]

And that process of the derivation of the link is the task of 'literary history'.

But then, have we established the autonomy of literature and highlighted its characteristic aspects to avoid the criticism that such approach to the study of literature does not respect its specificities?

Reference is made here to the rather vulgaristic deduction made from literature on the basis of the theory of 'reflection'; instances of such historical over-simplifications are rampant in Tamil Literary history.[4] The tendency to take literature as part of the super-structure which is invariably found to reflect the changes in economic organization is also high. Literature, it is true, is culture ridden; it is also culture *forming*. Very often the creative and the intellectual processes involved in the 'birth' of literature, the sense of selectivity that pervaded the age and the social character of that process of selectivity are forgotten. It has become usual even among competent writers to take literature as too much of a mirror and try to read into it even the slightest changes in economic organization.[5] This is perhaps due to an oversimplification of the base-superstructure concept.

Whilst applying the base-super structure concept, it was never understood fully that "when we talk of the 'base', we are talking of a *process* and not a state. And we cannot ascribed that *process* certain fixed properties for subsequent deduction to the variable process of the super-structure".[6] Developments in Marxist thought, arguing the need to look for a social totality (Lukacs) within which one should look for distinct structural levels (Hindess & Hirst) have provided better tools of analysis and instead of the oversimplified base--Superstructure concept in which literary changes and variations were equated almost one to one with social and political changes,

we have to now take cognizance of the idea which Walter Benjamin so effectively expressed:

> "For it is not a question of showing the written works in relation to their time but of presenting the time which knows them that is our time in the time when they originated. Thus literature becomes an organon of society and the task of literary history is to make it this--and not to make it the material of history." [7]

This idea, which sees literature as 'organon'--instrument of thought--was expressed as far back as 1931, has now been fully worked out in such detail that no serious study on the tasks of literature and of literary history leaves it unnoticed. Raymond Williams presents the argument as follows:

> "The literature is there from the beginning as a practice in the society. Indeed until it and all other practices are present, the society cannot be seen as fully formed." [8]

It is quite clear that no society can be deemed to have formed itself, without literary formation. Literary formation is integral to social formation. In other words, there cannot be a society organised in the real sense of the term, without a literature for itself. At this stage, we should remind ourselves of the fact that literature need not be written; it has been primarily oral.

This view of literature as an essential aspect of social formation, has important implications for literary history; "On the one hand the work of art (is) a product of its time, a mirror of its age, a historical reflection of the society to which both the author and the original audience belonged. On the other hand it is surely no idealism to assume that *the work of art is not merely a product, but a producer of its age; not merely a*

mirror of the past but a lamp to the future."[9] Literature is 'producer' of an age or of a particular time in that it is in a literary work that the problems of the age are depicted in human terms. The characters may be even not human beings but they would be depicted in human terms. Literature, thus, provides a human perspectivity and the reader is able to identify the period in terms of the character of its human emphasis. The role of the 'dominant ideology' in enabling to highlight that particular aspect is very important and should be studied.

This view of literature, which highlights, as described by Hans Robert Jauss, *the society-forming function of literature*[10] has a great bearing on literary history. From a Taineian point of view of literature in which we identify moment, race and milieu (and this marks the beginnings of literary history proper) we are now coming on to a position in which as Harry Levin says, "Literature is not only the effect of social causes, *it is also the cause of social effects."*[11]

Viewed in terms of the perspective of the 'totality' of 'social life' this idea that *literature is both the product of its age and also its producer* shows clearly the role literature plays in social relations. Social relation is generally defined as, "Social interactions generating and generated by social links and these social relations, for purposes of social cognition, are differentiated into material and ideological social relations. Ideological relations as opposed to material social relations, do not exist independently of consciousness. However having passed through consciousness and will, they become the social form of practical activity in the sphere of social super structure, thus acquiring a being outside consciousness."[12] *The manner the material social relation is depicted in literature, the ideological relation is brought into focus.* Literature helps to mould ideological relations out of social consciousness and

then, in the manner it is circulated as a work, read and/or listened to and discussed gets reified. It is by doing this literature 'products' the age. The reified presentation gives a clear view of the whole age, thus becoming an important factor in creating social effects.

Literature hereby creates the mode of consciousness and this can in a historical perspective become an indicator of national consciousness.

All these indicate the importance of literature in social formation; "Social formation is a descriptive concept that denotes an actual and societal entity with all its particularities, products of past developments, structuration and restructuration, results of accidents and design, and all its legacies of the past and potential for future. As such it refers to a particular geographically bounded historically given entity with given resources and given forms of economic and political organization and cultural features".[13]

This concept of social formation and its validity to act as the criterion for periodisation is to be discussed later. Hence no attempt is being made now to explain the concept and relate it to literature. The only point that is emphasized at this stage of the argument is that literature is part of social formation and that it should be seen not only as reflecting society but also as society forming.

When this view of literature is taken as worthy of serious consideration, then, as already indicated, literary history becomes an extremely significant intellectual pursuit. It therefore behoves us to clarify what is meant by literary history and what are involved in the study of it.

It is essential at this stge to clarify a basic position relating to literature, something relating to its 'literaryness'. When once we accept the validity of the "social-

forming characteristic of literature, it is easy to use past literature, as evidence, to see how that society was formed and how that literature itself was integral to that formation. Such a use of literature, is not going to highlight the significance of it as creative literature. In using past literature for that purpose, that literature is as good as any other historical source, an archaeological artefact or an historical relic. The all important characteristic of literature is that it is not only a product of the past; it has also relevance to the present. Ilanko or Milton, Kamban or Shakespeare are contemporary in their relevance as they are products of the past."

"It is this characteristic of literature that makes literary history significant and the problems relating to it interesting. We shall soon come back to the "past significance and present meaning" of literature; it has been given a prefactory mention here to indicate at the very outset itself, the specificity of literary history as a discipline.

'Literary History' as Ralph Cohen would define it "is a study of a series of works arranged in chronological order as integral parts of the historical process".[14] The last part of the sentence--"as integral parts of the historical process"--would include the study of both the culture ridden part of literature and the culture forming part of it, and the society forming part of its function and its reflective character.

This makes it imperative to have at the beginning an agreed chronology of the literary works. In the case of Tamil, the basic dispute between persons and schools of thought is in the question of chronology. The sociology of Tamil literary history has to be tapped to find the answer for this problem.[15] When the works are placed in chronological succession and efforts are made to find a pattern or to detect an order in them,

the exercise becomes one of literary criticism as much as it is literary history.

Herein lies the significance of literary history; on the one hand, it is a branch of applied historical studies, on the other, it is applied criticism.

First let the 'applied historical' part be explained.

> "Applied historical studies are explorations of the past undertaken with the explicit purpose of advancing social scientific inquiries. To participate in an overall scholarly enterprise in discovering and developing general laws of human behaviour,to test the modes of the social scientist by running through the dimension of time; to help 'clothe' the propositions of social science as to make them both verifiable are all facets of the applied historians' task".[16]

Literary history becomes applied historical studies in that it reveals the social relations of the past in a manner no other historical source could. Literary history is thus a meeting ground of two branches of human knowledge -- humanities and social sciences.

It is common knowledge that in Tamil literary history has served this function rather conscientiously and well at that. Works like 'Tamils 1800 Years Ago', 'Dravidian India', 'Tamil Studies', 'History of the Tamils upto 600 A.D.' are, in fact, 'applied historical' studies wherein the evidences found in Cankam and post Cankam literatures have been judiciously (and otherwise) used to reconstruct the social life of the ancient Tamils.[17]

The practice of literary history as criticism is pronounced only in the case of modern literary history. In the case of a chronological ordering of ancient and medieval texts, literary criticism as a conscious factor

did not come into much play. It cannot be denied there is a literary critical heritage based on the commentarial traditions. It was more of a guiding ideology--a literary ideology--which was not put down as a well structured system of criticism. And the ideology (or ideologies) had religious overtones. Besides, this critical ideology embraced both literature and grammar, and grammar here is nothing more than linguistic, stylistic and literary norms for 'composition'. It is also important to remember that literary criticism as a separate branch of literary study emerged after the growth of modern Tamil Literatures. At the start it was called *Ilakkiya Vimarcanam* (examination of literature) and with the movement for the use of (pure) Tamil words, the term *Ilakkiya tiranaivu* (examination of the literary skill or skill in literature) is in vogue. The first works in literary criticism in Tamil dealt with modern literature.[18]

The main shortcoming in contemporary Tamil literary scholarship is that it has not viewed the entire literary heritage of the Tamils ranging from Kapilar to Murugaiyan, Valluvar to Selvaraj as one integrated whole. The tendency has been and is to view ancient and modern literatures as mutually exclusive.[19]

Thus the critical aspect of the literary history of Tamill attempted so far has not been well pronounced and we have not been able to evolve a critical basis that would encompass the whole of Tamil Literature.

Nevertheless there is an underlying 'critical" sense which is necessary to shape any literary historical thought and, as we shall see later, that looms more an ideological orientation than as an ordered critical system.

Having seen the genetic connections, literary history has with applied historical studies and with literary

criticism. We should now discuss the vital aspect of literary history—'past significance and present meaning'.

While we are at this point, it is useful to know of the contemporary situation of this discipline--literary history and the intellectual pressures it had been subjected to, mainly because it runs counter to the empiricist outlook of New Criticism and to the socio-political demands of anti-Marxism and anti-Communism.

Literary history, from a position of biographical and bibliographical information began to develop as a branch of study with Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), Friederich Schlegal (17??-1829), Hegel (1770-1831) and Madame de Stael (1766-1817) the latter in her work De La Litterature (1800) "had drawn up a rather vague scheme of history of literature determined by society".[20] It was with the discovery of the sociological principles in literature that literary history began to develop as distinct discipline and in that development Hippolyte Taine; known as, the founder of the sociological science of literature, brought in his concept of "race, milieu and moment" and claimed that "if these forces could be measured and deciphered, one could deduce from them, as if from a formula, the characteristics of the future civilization".[21]

Literary history, in the sense of history in terms of literature, began to develop as a discipline becoming a part of social history and supplementing general history.

While there was considerable attraction towards this line of development there were 'theorists' who simply denied that literature has a history. W.P.Ker argued, for instance, that we do not need literary history, as its objects are always present, are 'eternal'

and thus have no proper history at all. T.S.Eliot also would deny the pastness of a work of art. "The whole of literature of Europe from Homer,' he says, 'has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order".[22]

The development of literary history as past of social history is dealt with by Rene Wellek.

> "Even more widespread and successful have been the attempts to absorb literary history into general history, particularly the attempt to reduce it to a mirror of social change. I need only allude to the oldest systematic scheme of this kind. Hippolyte Taine's triad of milieu-race moment which is, however misunderstood, if interpreted as a version of positivistic determinism. I have tried to show that Taine was rather something of a Hegelian. Harry Levin particularly in his GATES OF HORN fruitfully developed the idea of literature of an institution. Renata Poggioli has proposed an application of Pareto's sociology to literary historiography using terms such as 'residue' and 'derivation' for a new periodization of literature. *Poggioli's Theory of the Avante-garde* analyses a master current sociologically. He believes in the imperative of the period. The artist dwindlers to the dimension of a victim of social forces.
>
> Obviously, Marxism has been by far the most influential in interpreting literary history as a reflection of social and economic forces. Literature becomes 'ideology' overt or implied statement about class situation and consciousness".[23]

This is Rene Wellek, the author of *The rise of English Literary History* (1941) writing in 1979 on the *Fall of Literary History* pronouncing the final verdict on a discipline he very much wanted to develop earlier. *"There is no progress*, no development, no history of art

except a history of writers and institutions or techniques. This is, atleast for me, the end of an illusion, the fall of literary history".[24]

The history between 1941 and 1979 from the 'rise' to the 'fall' is rather interesting. It is a history of politics and aesthetics combined.

On one hand it was found that "Marxism, by redefining milieu in economic terms, has presented a more rigorous theory of historical causation than Taine's and a more ruthless cannon of political allegiance than Brandes. It has introduced criticism to a sociological system which is highly illuminating and a social doctrine which is highly controversial".[25]

The aesthetics of New Criticism did not want the reader to go beyond the text and the reader's response.

Torn between these two polarities, attempts were made to write evolutionary literary histories of genres and types emphasizing the artistic concept. And there was also severe criticism made at those national literatures which sought to highlight the socio-historical aspects (Rene Wellek's review of Spiller *et. al.*) Literary History of the United States (1947) in Kenyon Review XI (1949). While on one hand there is an accusation that historical materialists are importing politics into literature, it will be most interesting to see how the very social basis of literature is denied by those who find themselves politically ill at ease with Marxism.[26]

The governing tendency in recent western literary criticism has been the lack of the historical element. The Times Literary supplement observed in 1970 that "the historical element is still what is most conspicuously lacking in the way critics approach their given tasks".[27] And as Graig commented, "the stress or weight of critical effort in our time has leaned very little towards the explanatory aspect; that is, the histo-

rical".[28] The ideological need for this a historicism is not far to seek. It definitely lies within the logic of the anti-Marxist approach to problems.

It is no surprise that literary history suffered as a result. The historiography of literary history was being tailored to meet these positivist needs. But there were sharp intellectual reactions too. And the following portion of Professor Steven Marcus' review of Ian Jack's *English Literature 1815-1832* in Oxford History of English Literature (1963) is fully diagnostic of the anti-historicist trend.

"...................................

> The major decisions in writing literary history have to do with contexts; how wide or narrow is the context in which you choose to regard a work of literature; how many influences are you willing to see playing on it simultaneously; how many relevant connections with the world outside literature are you willing to attribute and able to suggest . . . . .
>
> ....
> ....
> ....
> ....
>
> "And in the end it is the narrowness of his idea of literary history that does the most damage to his understanding; in this connection it seems reasonable to ask whether it is literary history as a mode of discourse or intellectual discipline that is most questionable or the current state in our culture, at least, of the historical disciplines in general. To those of us who understand the study of literature--including literary history--to be inseparable from the study of man, society and civilization, Mr.Jack's book is a disappointment. It disappoints in the degree that we are led by its author's knowledge, scholarship and intelligence, by his critical

gift and humane wit to expect a great deal and in the degree that those expectations are violated".[29]

The state of the discipline gave cause for concern and new attempts were made to identify and/or chalk out new directions for the area. The journal 'New Literary History' was one such attempt. The tenets of literary history as a discipline were re-examined.

Cohen's statement on what constitutes 'literary history' is worthy of serious study in relation to Tamil literary history itself.

"What, then, is the literary history that engages these critics? It is, to begin with, a history of the relation of readers to works. These relations governed as they are by the method of question and answer permit a systematized succession. And this system of relations is literary, because it deals with the changing functions of literary features, with changes of conventions, with changes in the meaning of language codes. *But the concept of 'change' is itself a historical category, so that theoretical premises, no less that relations, require historical explanations for their genesis and revision. Thus 'literary history' even if critics consider it peripheral to interpretation becomes a presupposition to all critical activity.* The tripartite distinction of literary theory, literary criticism, literary history breaks down into different functions of the critic-text relationship. Theory, criticism, history all presuppose organizing concepts that are necessarily historical. And the purpose of this activity is not only to systamatize the study of literature, but to make it possible for the critic to define himself in his response by attending to those of others".[30]

Criticism can no more be adamantly a historical; changes in literary features has to have a historical explanation.

It is at this juncture, the point made earlier about the 'Past significance and present meanings' has to be discussed. Robert Weimann's now famous contribution in this field 'Past Significance and Present Meaning in Literary History' deals with this problem in a very enlightening manner.[31]

His approach to literary history is basically dialectical and he states the problem of literary history has to be considered *from an angle where literature is history and history is an element of literary structure and aesthetic experience* . The discussions we have had on the society forming character of literature becomes clear now. Also the 'reflection theory' part of it (literature as mirroring socio historical changes) could be seen to be treated here as not merely as an extrinsic product but as something intimately interwined in what we consider beautiful and good.

It is the present meaning of the literary works which makes our literary heritage a living thing. The need for literary history arises not just because there are 'old' literary texts; it is there also to understand the process by which literatures, though produced in an age bygone, have also a contemporary appeal and relevance. Literary history would, therefore, involve *both genesis and value development and order, the work of art as product of the past and the work of art as an experience of the present.*

The process of understanding literature 'as product of the past' and 'as an experience of the present' is not and should not be taken as two different, mutually exclusive, things. If they are done so, tendencies to value literature for its antiquity (and for the sake of it alone) and to value literature for the sake of the 'enjoyment' it provides would begin to dominate.

It is not difficult to find Tamil Parallels to such unwelcome tendencies; praising literatures for their

antiquity and unintelligibility and treating poems as after dinner exhilarations have been found to exist among those who claimed Tamil scholarship. Whereas the former led to a neglect of the literatures by the younger generation, the latter led to uncritical interventions into texts.[32] To Marimalai Atikal, the champion of the purist movement in Tamil, 'modern' (later) poets are those who come after 14th century A.D. (after Umapathy Sivam) and the entire range of works produced after that period is virtually of no use; they do positive damage to the great Tamil Literary tradition![33]

These types of views are not going to help to know fully the literature and the community that produced it. The greatness is, therefore, in its continuity and not in its antiquity. And there should also be concern for its continuity in the future, not in the exact way it existed in the past but in the manner it is going to respond to the need of the speakers so that it could continue to be their source of expression, vital and vibrant. The historical genesis of a work is studied to understand its modern relevance. And that modern relevance is not to be seen in the activities of those indulging in its literary finesse in evenings, after office hours and in retirement.[34] The Modern relevance depends on how an effective lamp it is going to be for the future.

Would tnis then mean that literary history would, after placing the work in its historical context, involve a search for the 'Universals' it is possessing? It is true that there are certain 'universals' in human life and the significance of these 'universals' lies in that they are capable of performing a social function, fulfilling a particular historical need at every particular time. It would, therefore, become essential not just to speak of the universals as non-variables but to see how in a particular socio-historical situation they had played a vital role. The literary universals, would then, make sense only after a complete understanding of

the times concerned. Also important would be to understand the type of social emphasis given to these 'Universals' at various times. This would mean, as Weimann so emphatically declares, how we *relate* the past literature to the present. The task of literary history is to help us do that. It is not the pastness of the literature alone, nor it resourcefulness to enjoyment that is important. What is important is how from that past it can speak to the present, how to look at it so that we could clarify the genesis of its past and delineate its modern relevance. This is literary history as criticism, something which is lacking in Tamil today.

Viewed this way, literary history is not something that is of interest only to the academic alone; it is equally, if not more, essential to the creative writer, for such a history which is both history and criticism, provides him with a vision to see his own role and assess his own writings in historical and social perspective.

A historiographical review of how we 'saw' ancient Tamil literature and how some of us see it, would indicate to us the premia we have had for the literary past and the sway the past had had on us. It would also reveal to us the difficulties we have in reconstructing our literary history and differences of opinion we have in understanding that history and making use of it.

II

THE RISE OF LITERARY HISTORY IN TAMIL

I

An attempt will be made in this paper to see the origins, the early development and the present growth of the writings dealing with the history of Tamil Literature and with the literary history of the Tamils.

Being the first effort to observe this development, the initial plan was to chalk it out as a narrative; but the demands of this inquiry would not benefit by a 'pure narrative'. Besides, there is no such thing as 'pure narrative'. There is always a hypothesis that underlies the structure of the narrative, and that hypothesis constitutes the *Weltenscheung* of the narrator. There is no delineation of a process without an underlying idea about that process.

In the case of tracing the growth of literary history in Tamil, what we should attempt to give is a comprehensive account of the works written so far on the subject. Tamil has no exhaustive bibliography yet and there is no work in Tamil comparable to 'English Books in

Print'. The Delivery of Books and Newspapers Act of 1958 of India and the Registration of Books and Periodicals Act (1948) of Sri Lanka have ensured the cataloging of the books published in the languages of the countries concerned. The attempt of the Government of Tamilnadu to publish an entire catalogue of Tamil books has not been very successful. Kamil Zvelebils' comment while writing on Zieganbalg's (in India 1706-1719) Bibliotheca Malabarica (1708) is yet true; "In its third part, he (Zieganbalg) gives a relatively complete account of Tamil Literature containing remarks on the contents and literary form of 119 Tamil texts. More than two centuries after Zieganbalg, we still have no treatment of Tamil Literature in its entirety, from its beginning to its present shape".[1]

The task becomes all the more different to get at books which deal with this problem. In a culture which had encouraged the exclusive possession of certain forms of knowledge in a socially exclusive manner, there is no readiness to share the source of that knowledge with another. But for the most welcome reprints done by the Asian Educational Service, there would have been real difficulty in getting copies of old publications. All the libraries are not fully equipped either. There is, therefore, no claim of an exhaustive bibliographical survey in this paper. Nonetheless, thanks to institutions like Karantai Tamil College Library, the Maraimalai Atikal Memorial Library, the French Institute of Indology, the libraries of the Annamalai and the Madras Universities and to the warm hearted openness of individuals like Sri T.N.Ramachandran of Thanjavur, an effort was made to go through most of the important books. And the data collected thus, when placed chronologically enables us to see a discernible pattern of development.

Before we get on to see the order in which the writing of histories of Tamil Literature has been developing, we should at first enquire into those intellectual

and academic situations which lead to (a) the consciousness to write a history of literature and (b) to the actual writing.

Rene Wellek, one of the pioneer schools in the historiography of literary history shows how the study began.

> "The rise of literary history was a slow process, incomprehensible unless we see it in close connection with the rise of modern criticism, biography, and historiography. It is a part of *one of the greatest revolutions in intellectual history of mankind of the awakening of the historical sense and modern self-consciousness.* Literary history, in the more narrow sense, developed by an obvious process of specialization from established forms like biography--which was originally of course not confined to literature and from the criticism of individual works or the poetries of single genres, which were slowly expanded to include a historical survey of the past literary history as a distinct discipline, arose only when biography and criticism coalesced and when, under the influence of political historiography, the narrative form began to be used. But this was a process which took almost two centuries. In early times we must look carefully to notice the seeds and forms which had a late flowering only in the eighteenth century"[2]

Written at a time (1947) when he was not weighted down by many of the ideological intransigencies he had to undergo later, this indicates quite clearly how literary history as a discipline developed.

Wellek's statement that 'the awakening of the historical sense and modern self consciousness' had been the chief intellectual source of the origins of literary history is very true and the process in the case of Tamil as we shall see later, will demonstrate

the truth. But what he gives as the causes for the emergence of the study in the narrow sense of the term, viz., 'biographies', 'criticism of individual works' and 'the poetics of single genres' cannot be taken as applying to all literatures, because that line of development, which to those familiar with western traditions would remind of Plutarch and Aristotle[3], need not necessarily take place in all cultures. For instance, in Tamil we do not have a 'Plutarch' until 1859 when Simon Casiechitty thinks that a work on the lives of the Tamil Poets should have that name; none the less biography of some of the Tamil poets called *Tamil Navalar Caritai* comes around the beginning of 18th century. The names of Tamil poets gets codified in a very different manner in the mythical narrative of the Cankam. The 'commentarial tradition' in Tamil could be equated with 'criticism of individual works', although there are differences in the two. As for 'poetics of single genres' we cannot cite a Tamil parallel. It would be difficult to equate Ceyyuliyal of Tolkappiyam with the poetics of Aristotle, the foremost difference being the aphoristic, prescriptive character of the former and the argumentative, expository character of the latter.

Nevertheless, when, as a result a colonically determined westernization and language based nationality--identity, there arose among the Tamils 'the historical sense and the modern self-consciousness', consciousness about their literature was also much in evidence. *In fact consciousness of the literary heritage was a cause and an index of Tamilian nationality consciousness.*

But to begin at that historical point of time (that is late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries), and take it as the beginnings of the study of literary history in Tamil, would be too much of an eurocentric view of Tamil literary history.

Historiography too lies within history and it is inevitable that the growth of literary history itself

has to be studied in historical terms, that is in a chronologically placed order of the succession of authors, works, views, ideologies etc. The Foregoing discussion reveals that we would have to look for the beginnings of literary history in the sense we understand it today only in the period of western influence. But that should not mean that there was no concept of literary history in Tamil in the pre-Western period. The discipline we now call literary history has arisen out of and is determined by a particular mode of literary and historical consciousness. Without going into the specific characteristics of this mode of (national or nationality) consciousness, we can say that it has been shaped by the historical fact that the Tamils had to live under and share with non-Tamils a culturally alien polity, which led to language as the major identity marker of this group. In other words, the mode of literary consciousness has been determined by the fact that Tamils have been living with other language groups. The manner the Tamilian looks at Tamil Literature is largely determined by this fact. The need to emphasize the antiquity and to argue out the question of influence from other languages arose because of the fact we have to emphasize the significance of Tamil in a multi-lingual situation in which Tamil enjoyed no hegemony.

But this does not mean that in the pre-Western period, there were no historical situations in which the Tamils had to live under a non-Tamilian polity. These were instances--the rules of the Telugu-speaking Nayakka chieftains, of the Maratta chieftains, even the rule of a Sultan at Ma'bar. Of course these rules did not cover the entire Tamilnadu. The impact of these rules were limited to certain areas only. Further, except in the case of the Sultan's rule, these rules were not culturally alien. Even under the Sultan's rule the pace of acculturation was rather high.[4]

Naturally the mode of consciousness relating to the legacy of literature would differ under these circumstances.

II

It is proposed in this chapter (a) to indicate first the phases in the development of writings on the history of Tamil Literature and (b) to discuss these phases in greater detail.

The main feature in deciding upon the various phases of the development of this writing is finding out the type of consciousness that was existing at the level of the culturally articulate groups during each of these phases about the literary heritage in Tamil. An attempt has been made to mark out the dominant form of consciousness of the literary heritage, the manner this consciousness found expression, that is, what was done in concretisation of this consciousness. Social being determines social consciousness and consciousness of the literacy heritage is a manifestation of certain socio-cultural necessities.

Rene Wellek identifies patriotism as one of the major factors that helped the evolution of literary history;[5] Patriotism is seen in the pride in the achievement of the community's past. Equally important is the need to consolidate some gains.

Taking the mode of consciousness among the articulate groups of the day as the criterion and the character the consciousness expressed itself, the following phases are suggested.

i - pre 1700
II - 1700 to 1835
III - 1835 to 1929
IV - 1930 onwards
(a) 1930-1950
(b) 1950-

The basis for phasing out the development of literary historical writing like this should now be given briefly.

Eighteenth century marks the beginning of the change in the traditional mode of intellectual life in Tamilnadu. But for the coming of Islam which soon became an exclusive organisation using not Tamil but Arabic Tamil, that writing Tamil connected with Islamic matters in Arabic Script, there was no serious intrusion made in the continuity of a literary tradition that was moulded by the Hindus, the Jains and Buddhists, all integral parts of Indian culture, acting with mutual impact on one another. True, Roman Catholicism had already come in and great missionaries like De Nobili had worked in Tamilnadu, but it was with the beginning of the 18th century that the Protestant missionaries start their activities in Tamilnadu. Zieganbalg and Plutschaeu arrive in Tamilnadu in 1709.[6] Fr.Beschi, the most prolific Roman Catholic writer comes in 1710. It is with Fr.Beschi that Tamil Catholic literary activity gets integrated to Tamil literary legacy.

The arrival of the Protestants in the 18th century has a two fold significance, firstly, it is through them that some of the characteristic post-renaissance, European attitudes (which lead to new ways of looking at society) come into Tamil and secondly, being primarily a religion based on literacy, protestantism was responsible for the inauguration in a big way of the 'print culture' in Tamilnadu. The Protestants hitched conversion to education and their educational system was based on the printed text books. It is true that printing was known to Tamil and that the first Indian language to use the 'Wooden block-type' was Tamil, but, that type of printing did not revolutionise the world of Tamil knowledge as the eighteenth and nineteenth century Christian owned printing machines which fed a larger number of Tamil literates.

Thus the beginning of the eighteenth century seems to mark off historically a period, which though not culturally homogeneous, had almost the same type

of literary communication. The patron-client system that is very much the characteristic of the literary production in the pre-eighteenth century also changes after the eighteenth century.

The next landmark in the consciousness of the literary heritage is intimately connected with the opening-up of the print medium to all, irrespective of religion. This takes place in 1835 when Sir Charles Metcalfe removed the restrictions on printing. It was in 1835 that 'natives' were given the right to own printing presses. Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy states that it was only after 1835 that old Tamil texts, which were in old manuscript form, were printed.[7] Murdoch's statement, though it challenges the rather dogmatic character of the above statement proves in main the argument of Venkatacamy.[8] Rev.W.Taylor states that upto 1835, the only Tamil works printed by the natives were the Kural and some trifles by Auvaiyar. In that year Sir Charles Metcalfe removed the restrictions on printing and soon afterwards native presses began to be established.

1835, therefore, constitutes a definite landmark in the reproduction of the literary heritage and those socio-political factors which began to assert themselves as the century drew to a close and in the next century created a new awareness among Tamils.

The geographical constitution and the demographic composition of the Madras Presidency of the British days created problems of identity for the Tamils in their own traditional homeland. The demographic character of the Madras Presidency created this. The Brahman-non-Brahman conflict, the super-structural symbol of this conflict viz., the question of the supremacy of Sanskrit over the regional culture, the living together within the same administration unit with Telugus, Malayalees and Kannadigas, the Role of regional language consciousness in the struggle for Indian Independence, the need to highlight the often overlooked historical

achievements of the South, all joined together to create a new awareness in the Tamilian cultural heritage and consciousness of the past literary achievement was one form of it.

The search for the next landmark in the consciousness of the literary heritage, or to be exact, the search to spot in time a noticeable departure in the main trend of events mentioned earlier, should lead us to the thirties of this century the Government of India Act of 1935 is a major water shed in this development.[9] Significantly enough the first comprehensive history of Tamil Literature in Tamil K•Subramaniapillai's *Ilakkiya Varataru* was published in 1930.

The thirties constitute the beginning of a socio-political process which goes on even now. Independence in 1947 is no doubt a landmark. But when we look into the question of nationality formation in India, and the problem of state-centre relations, language consciousness looms large in the post 1947 era. The formation of the DMK in 1949, just after independence and the use it made of the literary heritage of the Tamil as the rallying point to bring various religions and social groups of Tamils together, made the concern for literary history part of the political upkeep of the government. That is why it is suggested that the development in the post thirties be taken as two units, one upto 1950 and the other from 1950 onwards.

This is, in brief, the rationale for the phases suggested.

III

The mode of consciousness of the literary heritage that existed in the pre-eighteenth century should now be seen.

The consciousness of a literary heritage is necessarily a consciousness of a past activity of the group and

any evidence of a concern for that literary past should be taken as constituting an activity concerning its history. At this point, we should remind ourselves of the special characteristics of the consciousness of literary heritage; past literature is studied for its past significance and present meaning. So if we come across any activity concerning compilation or codification of literature, it should definitely be taken as consciousness of literature, both past and contemporary. It should be taken as an activity connected with history of literature. The relevance of such an activity to literary history, in the sense it has been seen in this study--history in terms of literature, can be explained as one which has a significance in the community's consciousness of its own history. Any instance of such historical consciousness should be taken as a form of consciousness relating to history of literature and literary history. Such a consciousness of the literary heritage is seen in the history of Tamils at a fairly early age. The anthologisation done of the 'Cankam' poems is the first instance we have in Tamil literary history of a major interest in consolidating the literary gains of the past.[10]

The poems are found in two collections. *Ettutokai* (ET) and *Pattuppattu* (PP). PP is an anthology of ten individual poems and 'each of the ET collection is itself an anthology of poems credited to various poets'. Marr has challenged the inclusion of *Pattuppattu* among the Cankam works.[11]

Our concern here is with these two anthologies. It is true that the terms *Ettutokai* and *Pattuppattu* are rather late. The term '*Pattuppattu*' comes in Panniru Pattiyal, a work of 11th or 12th century and the combined use of the terms ET and PP as referring to the anthologies is seen 'for the first time in Peraciriyar's commentary on Tol.por.362 and 392 and in Mayilainathar's commentary on *Nannul* 387 (both 13th-14th c.A.D.).'[12]

But it is not the nomenclature of the major groups that matters. It is the anthologistic character of each of the collection in *Ettutokai*, that matters.

Narrinai	(NT)
Kuruntokai	(Kur)
Patirruppattu	(PrP)
Purananuru	(PN)
Akananuru	(AN)
Ainkurunuru	(Aink)
Kalittokai	(Kalit)
and Paripatal	(Parip)

There is in existence a clear tradition relating to the anthologising of each of these collections. The basis of the compilation of the *akam* songs seems to be the length of the poems.

Aink	3-6 lines
Kur	4-8 "
NT	9-12 "
AN	13-31 "

Puram songs do not have such a grouping. PrP is exclusively on the Cera Kings but PN contains poems on all the Kings.

What is of great significance to the literary historian is that the names of the Kings who commissioned the compilation and the poets who compiled them are available.

AN - Commissioned by--Pantiyan Ukkirapperu Valuti
Compiled by--Mathurai Uppurikutikilan makan Uruttiracanman.[14]

Kur - Commissioned by - Yanaikkatcey Mantaranceral Irumporai

Compiled by - Pulatturai Murriya Kutattur Kilar.

Kali - Commissioned by - not known
Compiled by - Nallantuvanar

Kur - Commissioned by - not known
Compiled by - Purikko[15]

NT - Commissioned by - Pannattu Tanta Pantiyan Maran Valuti
Compiled by - not known

PrP
Parip
PN - The details relating to compilation and commissioning for compilation are not known. PrP being exclusively on the Cer must have been compiled with Cera knowledge and/or assistance

Kamil Zvelebil's discussion on this question throws much light on the date of anthologisation.[16]

As he says 'in some cases the first compilation was not much removed in time from the stage of the actual composition of some of the poems; it may even have been contemporaneous with it'. The dates of some of the Kings who had commissioned the compilation are of importance. Yanaikkatcey Mantaranceral Irumporai--ca 210-320 A.D. and Pannatu Tanta Pantiyan Maran Valuti--ca 215 A.D. The latter is taken as the author of NT 97,301 and Kur 270. *Kalittokai* is generally taken as belonging to the post-Cankam, Pre-Cil.era.

The major question now is what were the factors that necessiated the compilation. The interest shows by kings is clearly indicative of the fact that this compilation had a socio-political relevance, if not a necessity. Vansina shows the need for bardic poetry in stabilising royal pedigree and legitimising the rule of the monarch.[17] That, of course, is very much a 'contemporary' need. But this anthologising is done almost at the close of

the Cankam period Nilakanta Sastri takes Civca 250 AN as the closing year of the Cankam era.[18]

I have argued elsewhere that the main cause for the disintegration of the Cankam period be seen in the slow transition from tribal grouping to territorial sovereignty.[19] It is highly probable' that this compilation of the poems of the bardic phase was to consolidate the literary gains of the immediate past and thus ensure the continuity of the royal lines.

Also perhaps it was connected with the increasing use of writing. In this connection we have to ask the important questions, what was the process of compilation, what constituted the source for the compilation and how was the compilation done. The answers to this question would perhaps lead to this problem of transition in Tamilnadu from oral poetry to writing them down.

The political significance of these poems, both akam and puram, are too well known to be restated here.[20] What needs clarification here is the need for compiling them after composition. It is quite clear that the preservation was done because that past literature (how past we do not know) had a 'present' relevance. And we have already seen that literary history is a study of checking out the 'present' responses to the past literatures.

The Compilation of the Cankam poems, is thus a matter of literary historical interest.

The next time we come across such an effort of assessing the 'present' significance of past literature is when we are presented with the legend of the three Cankams in the commentary to Iraiyanar Akapporul (IA). Rm. Sundaram has conclusively established the date of this commentary as end of 7th century A.D.[21]

It has been generally taken as a work of 7th-8th c.A.D.

It is the first time that one comes across a well-structured account of the three Cankams with all the mythical details relating to the 'existence' of the three Cankams. Here again the account is too well known to be repeated.[22] But it is relevant to refer to some of the informations given in that account.

Serial No. of the Cankam	Duration	No.of Kings	No.of poets
1	4440	89	4449
2	3700	59	3700
3	1852	49	449

There are two more important details to be known:

(a) all the three Cankams were held at Madurai,[23] which turns out to be a hallowed Hindu centre in later times, and

(b) some of the names of the poets mentioned in the account as participating in the very first Cankam are names of Hindu deities.

-Tirupuram eritta Viricataikkatavul
-Kunrerinta Kumaravel

Agasthya, a name so recurrent in Hindu mythology is said to be a member of the first two Cankams.

It is quite clear that this legend comes after the heyday of the Jaina activities in Tamil Literature, after the Jaina oriented didactic literature have been written.

The manner the Jaina religious establishment operated, the use it made of literature and how that literary corpus produced by them constitute a radical departure from the previous literary trends are now part of established literary history.[24] The importance of the Dravida Sangam of Vajranandhi in the 'missionary activities of the Jaina has been mentioned.[25]

Both the Pandya Kingdom and the Pallava Kingdom, though pitted against one another, were providing State support for the Bhakthi movement.[26] It is also important to remember at this stage how the hymnists, both Saivaits and Vaisnavaits take Tamil as part and parcel of Saivaism or Vaisnavaism, as the case may be and how some of them like Tirugnanasambandar and Tirumankai Alvar were deadly hostile to Jainism.[27]

It is against this background that we should see the obvious Hindi bias of the Commentator of IA.

Myth making is a method of 'producing' history. The legend of the Cankam as seen in the commentary of IA is clearly an effort to 'hinduise' Tamil, especially make it part of the saivaite tradition. Seen this way the significances of this legend in Tamil literary history is very gret. It attempts to take over an obviously Jaina and Buddhist institution (Sangha) and give it a Hindu form and content. The more interesting part of that account is how the kings are brought into the story. In terms of the structure of the story, the reference to the number of kings who ruled during the period and the number of those kings who had taken part in the literary affair (composing poetry) are not that important. But that is made a vital part of the story. In fact that part of the commentary starts with the sentence.

> "தலைச் சங்கம், இடைச் சங்கம், கடைச் சங்கம்
> என மூன்று சங்கம் இரீஇயினார் பாண்டியர்"

"The Pandyas established three Cankams known as the Primeval, the Medieval and the Final Cankams."

Constructing a royal base for the Cankam in which the Gods themselves take part, legitimise, beyond question, the rule of the newly emerging Pandyas.

The Cankam legend is the first attempt at a Saivaite history of Tamil Literature.

The effort of some of the hymnists to attribute a purely Saivaite origin to Tamil and to place it along with Sanskrit, the liturgical language of Hinduism is only a step away from this. Reference may be made, in passing, to the Buddhist response to this association of Civan with Tamil. The author of Vira Coliyam, evidently a Mahayanist, states that Avalokitiswara 'gave' Tamil to Agasthiyan. Likewise the tradition regarding the Five Major Epics (Aimperungkappiam) and the Five Minor Epics (Aincirukappiam) is no doubt an attempt to highlight the Jaina and the Buddhist components of Tamil Literature. It is not surprising on the part of the Jaina and Buddhists to have attempted to highlight those works of their written at a time (9th to 11th), when their cultural fortunes were low.

Viewed in terms of the traditional manner historiography operated in that cultural milieu, these myths should be taken as efforts at 'history-making'. It was essential for any of the religion to lay claim to the language it was employing for its liter output.

The next major even in the history of the pre-18th century Tamilnadu, in relating past literature to contemporary socio-cultural and religio-political needs was the codification of Bhakthi hymns.

The role of the Bhakthi movement in the formation and the consolidation of the kingdoms of 7th century

A.D., and thereafter is very important. This is true of both the Pallava and the Pandya Kingdoms. The Pallavas of the Simhavisnu (560-580) line and the Pandyas of the Kadun Kon (590-620) line try to establish their authority within the territories of their rule and control the socio-economic organization and the life of the people in a manner unprecedented in the history of the Tamil country.[28] The Jaina and the Buddhist monasteries with their economic organization should have constituted a source of irritation for the firm establishment of that power.[29] The Bhakthi movement encompassing almost all the then existing castes of Tamilnadu, having even mutually good relation between Saivaism and Vaisnavaism challenging the might of the Jaina and the Buddhist organizations must have been also politically useful to the policy of the Pandyas and the Pallavas trying to establish full sovereignty within their kingdoms. The conversions of Kun Pandyan and Mahendravarman (580-630), especially of the latter, cannot be taken as mere religious acts with no political significance at all. The reference in Thevaram hymns to transferable money is very significant. The Bhakthi movement did not stop at being a popular literary movement. It sought to erect places of worship in stone.

The Jains and the Buddhists had only rock-cut caves for the tapas of the mendicants. Under the Pallavas and later under the Colas, temples were conceived and constructed as houses of Gods. Starting off as essentially rock-cut ones they soon began to develop into structures with exquisite halls, pillars and plasters, the logical development leading on to the magnificent structures at Thanjavur and Gangai Konda Colapuram. These temples are significantly not only for the great spiritual elevation they depict; they are equally if not more significant for the role they had in the socio-economic affairs of the region where they stood, and the pivotal position they had in the continuity of the social and the religious organization. The temple assumed an import-

ant role in the continuity of the socio-economic system of the Colas.[30]

It is in the background of this socio-economic compulsions and religio-cultural necessities that we have to look at the need for codifying the hymns of the Nayanmars and the Alvars.

The Bhakthi movement, it should be emphasized in spite of its distinct Saivaite and Vaisnavaite character, did not at the early stage reveal any inter Saiva-Vaisnava hostility. The Saiva-Vaisnava hostility seems to be a latter phenomenon and it is said that Manickavasaga's reference to Govindaswamy lying down opposite to the dancing Siva at Chidambaram[31] is one of the first references we have to underestimate Visnu in relation to Siva. But as time went on the two groups, Saivaites and Vaisnavaites had each developed distinct traditions for themselves.

By the tenth century the religious establishment had grown to such an extent that the management of the temples had an extensive administrative system and everything was done to ensure the smooth running of the temples. Of the numerous indispensable rituals in the daily routine of the temples one was the singing of the hymns of the three saints, Tirugnanasambandar, Appar and Sundarar. The significance of the hymns lies in the fact that some were on individual temples, thus sanctifying them as important centres and in that these could be sung at the various stages in the process of the daily pujas. Above all, these hymns being in Tamil were the only available liturgical texts that could involve the large bulk of the worshippers in the conduct of the pujas. Languagewise, these hymns were the only part of the ritual that emotionally bound the worshipper, for the rest of the proceedings were, and even today are, in Sanskrit. Thus for reasons of the efficient running of the institution and for purposes of religious communica-

tion it was necessary to codify those hymns and fix their pattern of singing. Of course 'the practice of reciting these hymns in temples had come into vogue long before the time of Rajaraja'.[32] They had already achieved the status 'divine literature' and had to be collated because as A.V.Subramania Iyer says, it is probably that a major portion of the Thevaram were not known to the people at that time. The collation was therefore a religious obligation; at the same time it would also help consolidate the very socio-political structure in which the temples operated.

The literature that contributed to the new socio-economic formation that started in the beginning of the seventh century with the Pallavas and streamlined and well stabilised during the Colas, now received attention for codification as திருமுறை Tirumurai; this whole process meant imposing a well-defined pattern on those texts sung by the hymnists at various times at various places in various musical forms.

> திருமுறையென்ற தொடரிலுள்ள முறையென்பது மேற்காட்டிய பல பொருள்களுள் நூலையும் அதன் உட்பிரிவுகளையுங் குறித்து வழங்குவதாகும். முறைப்பட இயற்றப் பெற்றமையின் முறை என்பது நூலுக்குப் பெயராயிற்று.[33]

This was in relation to the Saivaite hymns. This type of compilation was done for the Vaisnavaite hymns too.

Whereas the person who was responsible for the collation of the Saivaite hymns was Nambiandar Nambi, the person responsible for anthologizing the Vaisnavaite hymns was Nathamuni.

> "The alvars sang the praises of Vishnu in songs which are not explicitly philosophical in their content but merely abound in formulae of admiration. The contribution of the Acharyas from Nathamuni to

Ramanuja was to collect these verses and gave a philosophic content to them and build up the sri Vaishnava tradition on that basis. The credit of having collected the Four Thousand devotional (Nalayira Divya Prabandham) verses and set them to music belongs entirely to Nathamuni alias Ranganatha Muni (9th to 10th century A.D.). He edited the prabandhas on the vedic pattern into four books and started the tradition of treating them on a par with the vedas".[34]

There is a rather knotty problem as to which hymns were anthologized first, the Saivaite or the Vaishnavaite M.Srinivasa Iyengar was of the view that 'perhaps in imitation of the Saivaites the Vaisnava Acharyas may have got into their head the idea of collecting the works and compiling them into one sacred volume probably subsequent to the loborious undertaking of Nambiandar Nambi of the Saiva sect'.[35] According to him Nathamuni lived in the latter part of tenth century and early part of eleventh century.[36] Arunachalam takes the opposite view. According to him Nathamuni must have preceded Nambiandar Nambi, who must have compiled the Tirumurais between 1000-1040 A.D.[37] He goes to the extent of suggesting that Nambiandar Nambi does to Saivaism what was already done by Nathamuni to Vaisnavaism.

The general consensus among the historians is that Nathamuni's age 'would be the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth centuries A.D.' and that Nambiandar Nambi was most probably a contemporary of Rajaraja I (985-1014) and Rajendra I (1012-1044).[38]

It is therefore possible that the Vaisnava anthology was done, atleast slightly, earlier than the Saivaite anthology.[39]

There are two facts which are very significant about these collations from the point of view of this study.

The first is that each of the anthologies, was, in the course of collating the texts, very careful to get at the pattern of singing of the texts. The legend relating to the discovery of the Tevarams mentions how the divine voice directed the Cola King and the compiler to the lady from the family of Tiruneelakantap-perumpanar to know the proper way of singing the hymns.[40] The legend relating to the rediscovery of the music of the hymns indicates quite clearly that the musical tradition which was lost to the higher social groups was yet available at a lower level of the society.

The rediscovery of the musical tradition of the recitation of the Vaisnavaite hymns seems to have been much more difficult. Jagadeesan says: 'It seems that posterity was completely cut off from music that was really employed to sing the Prabandhas in the days of the Alvars'[41] and Nathamuni seems to have written the music for his collection with the aid of his nephews.

The importance given to the music of the compositions reveals the function for which the anthology was done. It was done primarily for the ritualistic purpose of singing the hymns at the temples. They were viewed as divine utterances not as literature in the sense the Cankam anthologies were considered. Nevertheless there was a consciousness relating to the literary aspect of the Bhakthi movement. Anyone with some familiarity with the history of the transmission of the texts of the plays of such great dramatists like Aeschylus or Shakespeare would know that the plays were first preserved for purposes of theatre and not for literature as such. It was at a later time that the literary significance becomes more important. Such a thing--the importance of the literary over the musical aspect--takes place at a later stage in the transmission of these texts

too and the work of Umapathi Sivacarya (late 13th-early 14th c), Thirumuraikanta Puranam, reveals the religio-literary significance of the Tirumurais. The hymns, their codification began to have more enduring hold on the tradition so much so not only was the anthologising and the history of anthologising began to be revered, but also the memory of the hymnists and other saints of that movement and later the memory of the person who wrote an account of their lives too was revered. Reference is made here to Cekkilar's Periapuranam, which sanctified the entire Saivaite Bhakthi movement and to the later Cekkilar Puranam written by Umapathi Sivacaryar on Cekkilar himself.

The second factor of importance relating to the anthologising of the Saivaite and Vaisnavaite hymns is that it was done in both cases, more so in the case of Saivaism than it was in the case of Vaisnavaism, with State assistance. The legends relating to the re-discovery of the Saiva hymns at Chidambaram indicate clearly that, but for the State assistance and intervention, the texts would have been lost for ever. Even in the case of Nathamuni, State assistance seems to have been substantial.[42]

The next important event in the history of Tamil Literature is the codification of the Saiva Siddhanta texts, which are doctrinal texts and not creative literary corpus at the Cankam and the Bhakthi anthologies are.[43] The sociological aspects of the philosophy of this system of Hindu thought need deeper investigation.[44] The sociological underpinning of this system to the highly organized Cola system and administration is important. There are a few facts of utmost importance.

(a) The first work of this system of thought Sivagnana Botham by Meikantar was written in the 'first half of the thirteenth century'--i.e., during the decline of the Cola period.

(b) Sivapragasar who writes eight of the Siddhanta Sastras (Sivaprakasam, Tiruvarutpayan, Vina Venpa, Porripahrodai, Kodikkavi, Nencu Vitu tutu, Unmaineri Vilakkam and Sankarpa Nirakarnam) belongs to the close of 13th and early 14th century--the period of political disintegration.

(c) These sastras became the philosophical sheet anchor of the non-Brahmin Saiva mutts and

(d) This doctrinal base constitutes the philosophical difference between the Vedantists and the Saiva Siddhantists.

Viewed in the background of these facts the codification of the Saiva Siddhanta Sastras and the commentaries written to these sastras by scholars and mendicants connected with the mutts. . . . , make the 'consciousness' of this literary heritage, something very significant in the development of Tamilian thought as a whole.

The association of the non-Brahmin mutts with the preservation and the explication of this literary heritage is an attempt to keep alive an important tradition of Tamil Literature The Pandara Sastras which really are explicatory works on some of the Siddhanta Sastras by the important dignitaries of the various mutts are only an extension of this literary persuit.

It may not be out of place here to mention that the theological, doctrinal abstraction of the constitutional hierarchy that the Cola rule was able to evolve and impose, later helped the non-Brahmin mutts to preserve the hierarchy from those below them. The caste exclusiveness of the mutts, their insistence on acaram (as was told to me by the head of a mutt), the economic dependence they impose on those under them, and the ritual salutations they expect from those who go to see them are matters of great importance

in analysing the social basis of the Saiva Siddhanta thought and practices as seen at these repositaries of this thought and 'culture'.[45]

The post-Cola developments in Vaisnavaism, as seen in the philosophical position of Ramanuja, in the emergence and the conflict of the Vadakalai-Tenkalai sects, in the manipravala writings, in which Sanskrit dominates, need a close sociological study.[46] In fact the Cola hostility to Ramanuja should be studied not merely in terms of philosophical disagreement but in terms of the possible social embarrassments the egalitarian teachings of Ramanuja could have had on the Cola polity. Whatever the cause may be, we find the Vaisnavaites becoming more and more withdrawn from the mainstream of Tamilian cultural thought which was dominated by Saiva Siddhanta and the madams. The Vaisnavaites also had internecine quarrels. However, the social implications of the Avatara concept (god can come in human form) and the concept of 'saranagati' should be studied more closely. These seem to stand in some polarity to the aloofness of godhead and the unalterable hierarchy of spiritual gradation in Saiva Siddhanta.

These could be taken as the major landmarks in the history of the consciousness relating to the Tamil literary heritage and Tamil literary thought in the pre-18th century phase. But there are a few minor instances too. One such instance could be seen in the emergence of such compilation as *Purattirattu.*[47] A work of circa 14th century, Purattirattu is a compilation of verses arranged thematically, for the use of those delivering discourses. It is told that it was referred to as *Prasankabharanam.* The thematic arrangement seems to be based on the titles of the chapter of Tirukkural.

The commentarial 'explosion' that begins with Ilampuranar in 10th-11th centuries and reaches its

climax in 12th-14th centuries involving such great names as Cenavaraiyar, Naccinarkkiniyar, Atiyarkku-nallar and Parimelalakar is also important in the history of the consciousness of the literary heritage of the Tamils.[48] The importance of the commentators should be seen in the fact, they;

(a) made intelligible texts which were becoming unintelligible to their contemporaries.

and/or

(b) made the works concerned relevant to their own time by indicating that what was mentioned by the author of the work had great implications.

In performing this function these commentators developed particular style of explication, as for instance why did the author say this and not that. This comes in the bhasya tradition too. The commentarial tradition also reveals the traditional manner literature was viewed and transmitted.

But all these expressions of the consciousness of the literary heritage were not able to bring about even a biographical recapitulation of the lives of the practitioners of Tamil poetry. There were instances of opinions being expressed on one work (Tiruvalluva-malai), of more than one commentary on one text (Tolkappiyam, Kural, Cilappatikaram) but we do not come across any biographical collation. We have of course seen bibliographical collections (ET, PP).

The first effort in Tamil to have a biography of the various Tamil poets is said to be in *Tamil Naval-ar Caritai*, a work, according to T.T.Kanagasundaram Pillai, belonging to the 18th century.[49]

III

The next phase is really a period of transition, an era that mediates between the Tamilnadu dominated by traditional literary norms and the Tamil region, very conscious of its presence within India as a whole and of the 'composite Madras State. We have for already reasons of literary communication, marked out this as beginning from the eighteenth century and going on until 1835.

Rajarigam's statement, made in relation to the rise of Christian literature in Tamil validates further the need to deal with this period separately.

> "Protestant missionaries, remembering how the vast power of the press had aided the Reformation in Europe employed this power, from the very start of their work. A printing press had been set up at Tranquebar as early as 1712. For a long time thereafter, the press in India was entirely under the control of the Government and missions. After 1835, when the liberty of the press was conceded by Sir Charles Metcalfe, the then Governor-General of India, presses under native management were set up throughout India".[50]

Rajarigam adds in his footnote: 'This is an epoch making event in the history of literature of India'.[51] This statement substantiates not only the lower limit for this phase but also reiterates the correctness of taking 1835 as a starting point for the nationally oriented book production.

As has already been explained, this is a period in which Tamilnadu was getting exposed to Christianity in quite an active manner and some of the Westerners, both Protestant and Catholics, take an abiding

interest in the language and literature and start translating Tamil texts or westerners. Most of such writers were missionaries; some were administrators.

Of the missionaries, the most important personality in this period, from the point of view of introducing the literary heritage of the Tamils to the West, is Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg living in India from 1706 to the time of his death in 1719. Ziegenbalg's *Bibliotheca Malabarica* (1708) contains a description of Tamil books in his possession. In its third part, he gives a relatively complete account of Tamil Literature, containing remarks on the contents and literary form of 119 Tamil texts'[52] 'Ziegenbalg also wrote in German in order to interpret and explain Tamil culture to his European friends. He was guided by the double objective of stimulating interest in the Indians and in the Tamilians and of facilitating the penetration of other missionaries into Indian life'.[53] There were also others like the Dutchman Valentijn who 'translated parts of Auvaiyar's Konraiventan and gave a long list of Tamil works referring to Thevaram, Tiruvacakam, Periyapuranam, Tirukkural, Nalatiyar and Tolkappiyam'.[54]

Of the administrators, two names are important, N.E.Kindersley and F.W.Ellis. Kindersley, a servant of the English East India Company was the first to translate Kural into English (1794) and what he has written on the situation of Tamil language and literature in the 18th century is also of great value.[55] Francis Whyte Ellis, the author of an outstanding English commentary of Kural was responsible for creating an interest in Tamil among the British officers of the day. 'The college at Fort St.George was chiefly the result of his untiring efforts'.[56]

Mention should also be made of the works of missionaries like J.P.Fabricus and Ch.Breithaupt who contributed to the awakening of European interest in Tamil Studies.[57]

As has already been mentioned this phase is only a curtain raise to the more important next phase and as such should be studied for those features that were to flower out later.

Perhaps the most important event of this period is writing of the Tamil Navalar Caritai. The date and the author of tne work are not known. The work has seen two editions, one by T.T.Kanagasundaram Pillai (1921) and the other by Avvai Duraiswamy Pillai (1949).

As Kanagasundaram Pillai quite rightly points out, this is not a complete biography of the important Tamil poets, it is a motley collection of biographies and contexts of poems with no reference to Ilanko, Cattanar, Tiruttakka Tevor and Cekkilar.

Avvai Duraiswamy Pillai in his edition has written a very stimulating note on the contemporary situation of history of literature and on how to write a history of literature. It looks rather unaccountable that a man who has written such a scholarly introduction has been not critical of the work itself. The notes he has written except in the case of footnotes are not distinguishable from the original text.[58]

The value of the work lies in the fact that is in the first attempt at writing a history of Tamil literature. From the various internal literary evidences it is held that it should belong to the eighteenth century. Seen in the context of the historical sense possible during the period, the characteristics of the work do not come as a surprise. The important factor about this work is that it is unimpressively biographical, and contextual and not bibliographical. In spite of all its drawbacks as a work on history of literature and poets, it is important, because it shows that the Tamil society has started looking objectively at its literatti and at its literature, however inadequate that might be. Given the socio-cultural features of

the day a work of their type unconnected as it seems to be from either the mutts or the fragmented principalities, could not have emerged as anything concrete. It is equally important to note at this juncture, though it is not very relevant to the point at discussion, that the post 14th century in Tamil Literature reveals in anti-establishment character not seen in the literatures of the earlier period. Quite unlike in the earlier period, when only the literature of the establishment was preserved, during this period and subsequently we find literary voices of dissent, may they be, the Siddha poetry or the satirical verses against particular chieftains, getting literary recognition. Culturally too, Tamilnadu has ceased to be a Hindu bastion, whether Saivaite or Vaisnavaite, Islam and Christianity, two non-Indian religions have come in and were trying to form their own 'groups' with literature as a base to sustain the emotional needs of their converts.

Perhaps these are the currents and the cross currents that necessitate a sort of a history of literature, with all its defects.

IV

The period 1835-1929 is perhaps the most crucial phase in the development of literary history in Tamil. Being the formative period in which steps in tune with both Western and traditional methodology were taken to understand and present the history of the Literature of the Tamils themselves, the historiographic approaches adopted during this period seem to have had a lasting impact on the approach to the subject, so much so it is yet difficult to persuade scholars and researchers to ask new questions and seek untraditional answers.

It would be less controversial and quite easy in terms of correlating events to take an exclusively literary point of view of this problem and treat the

whole question of the development of the history of literature, and along with it the question of the literary history, as merely problems of authors, dates and works and 'construct' a history, complete within itself, but not revealing nor showing any traces of the problems that rocked Tamilnadu during this period. A plea has already been made to view literary formation as part of social formation; that makes it obligatory to view this problem in a wider context. But caution seems to be very essential. This is only an attempt to delineate the development of literary historical studies and not literary history in general.

This is the period in which Madras, which was 'considered to be an administrative and cultural backwater'[59] in the early part of the British rule, became a focal point for all nationalists because of the anti and non-congress tendencies that were developing there. The period under survey (1835-1929) saw the politicisation of the Brahmin--non-Brahmin social antagonism, the rise of the Dravidan ideology, the formation of the Justice Party (1916), the beginning of the pure Tamil movement (1916) of Maraimalai Atikal and the birth of the self-respect movement and the rationalist movement of E.V.Ramasamy Naicker.

This was the period of the struggle for the identity of the Tamils as a cultural group. This struggle has to be differentiated from the struggle in the fifties (under the DMK) when the problem was one of defining the role of Tamils and Tamilnadu as a nationality and a State within independent India. The struggle in the period 1835-1929 was one establishing the cultural identity of the Tamils as Dravidians.

The Aryan-Dravidian polarisation in South India seems inevitable. As. T.R.Venkataramana Sastri states 'most south Indian Brahmins believe themselves to be 'Aryan' in race. They are attached to Sanskrit and

the Aryan culture and the religion which has become part of the composite religion named Hinduism. They do not feel called upon to abjure it. They are aware that a small section of non-Brahmins make a grievance of it. These speak of Tamil culture and of ,Dravidian culture as distinguishable from Sanskrit culture'.[60] The emergent non-brahmins socially kept aloof and professionally overwhelmed by the Brahmins sought to liberate themselves from this cultural domination by invoking the pre-Aryan glories of the Dravidians. This movement for their cultural identity began to manifest in all walks of life from politics to language.[61]

While this is the case in the Madras Presidency of India, in Sri Lanka the Tamil awakening took a different form. The Sri Lankan Hindu-Tamil response to christian proletization and westernization was the rise of a religio-literary movement which sought to preserve the identity of Tamils as Hindus against the encroaching missionaries, who modernized Tamil and reformed Tamil society.[62] Himself taking over the methods and forms of modernization populariz-ed by the Christian missionaries Arumuga Navalar started a programme of educational activities in which the Hindu-Tamil integration was emphasized.[63]

These facts, which indicate the historical trends of the periods, though cannot be discussed in full here, cannot be left unmentioned, for in this whole struggle for the acceptance of the historicity and the cultural individuality of the Tamils as a language--culture group, it was Tamil Literature, more than any-thing else that was called into establish the antiquity and the achievements of the Tamils.

A few instances would be useful.

C.Ramalinga Reddy in his foreword to T.R.Sesha Iyenger's The Ancient Dravidians says this:

"I hope this book will be but one of a series in which the whole field of Dravidian Civilization in all its parts, will be explored and presented. We Dravidians are proud to be shown that as between Aryan and Dravidian, if there has been borrowing on the one hand, there has been going on to the other; that if we received, we also gave; that what assimilation there has been mutual and not one-sided; and that the Hindu Civilization of today is the common heritage of both".[64]

In the preface to the book, T.R.Sesha Iyengar, evidently a Brahmin himself,[65] has the following to say:

"The object of the writer in offering this humble contribution is to set before the reader a truer conception of the place of the Dravidians in South Indian History,their distinctive culture, their solid and lasting contribution to the development of Indian thought and life and the profound and far-reaching influence they exercised upon some of the great nations of antiquity . . . .
. . . .
.. .. Though the writer is conscious that the attitude taken here is diametrically opposed to the long-cherised theories and deep rooted conviction of savants, he nevertheless ventures to put forth his view for what they may be worth, in the hope that at least the first step may be taken in the overthrow of Aryan bigotry and pride and in the recognition of the rich heritage brought by Dravidian forefathers to enrich the culture of Aryans".[66]

Further down he makes a statement, which makes literary history, the organon--instrument of thought--of political history.

"The literature of the Tamil is unique in the east. It is the outcome of the genius of the people them-

> selves. It is a mirror which reflects the civilization and institutions of the ancient Dravidians . . . . It is regrettable that considerable neglect should have fallen upon the great mass of early Dravidian, especially Tamil Literature. Overborne by Aryan legends and relegated to the limbs of oblivion by Indian scholars, who attached greater importance to Sanskrit, the language of the Aryan settlers of India, and its merits being kept too much in the shadow to the preference of European scholars for the study of Sanskrit, it has not had a chance of obtaining the notice it so richly deserves".[67]

These may be taken too overtly political. The introduction and preface written to works which are purely histories of literature reveal this fervour for the use of literature as the source of the early history of the Tamils.

Arnold Sathasivam Pillai, in the preface to his Pavalar Carittira Theepakam (1886) says this:-

> "Although we Tamils can boast of our poetic science and poetic literature and affirm that few nations on earth can boast of as many poets as the Tamils, yet it is strange and humiliating that no attempt has ever been made, either in ancient or modern times, to make a collection of the biographies of the numerous poets and poetesses that lived in Southern India and Ceylon . . . . To supply this want is the object of this undertaking".[68]

P.Sundaram Pillai in his preface to the reprint (1895) of his *'Some Milestones in the History of Tamil Literatures'* wants the 'Tamil scholars to interest themselves in such inquiries concerning their own language and history'. He also expresses the hope that the younger generation also gets interested in such research.[69]

The need for a history of Tamil Literature and the disdainful response some of the writings on Tamil Literature had from some Brahmins is well brought out by Chelva Kesavaraya Mudaliyar.

> ''இனி இப்பாலேய் தமிழின் தொல்மையை உணராதவர்களில் வடமொழி வலவர் சிலர் ''என்ன ஐயா, தமிழ் தமிழ் எனப் பெரு மலைவு செய்யா நின்றீர்?' உங்கட்கு வடமொழியைத் தழுவாத இலக்கியங்கள் உண்டா? பாரகாவியங்கள் உண்டா? தர்க்கம், வேதாந்தம் முதலான சாஸ்திரங்கள் உண்டா? உங்கள் தமிழைக் கட்டி வையுங்கள் எல்லாம் நாங்கள் சப்பி உமிழ்ந்த சக்கை தானே" எனக் கூறிப் பெருமிதமெய்துகின்றனர்''..[70].

> ''தமிழருடைய புராதனமான நிலையை ஆராய்ந்தறிவதற்குச் சரித முதலான சாதனங்கள் இல்லை. இல்லாவிடினும் பழைய இலக்கண இலக்கியங்கள் இதற்கு ஒருவாறு சாதனமாகும்.'' [71]

M.S.Purnalingam Pillai had this to say in the preface to his Primer (1904),

> "However defective it may be in point of chronology, the primer will justify its existence if it gives foreigners and our young men in college classes--an idea of the world of Tamil books, we have despite the ravages of time and white ants, flood and fire, foreign malignity and native lethargy".[72]

Equally revealing is the editorial preface in English for the Tamil book on the Cankam period of Tamil Literature by G.S.Duraiswamy Pillai of the Y.M.C.A. Tirunelvely (1923):

> The purpose of this series is to bring within the reach of educated Tamil people their cultural and religious heritage. There are more than twenty million whose mother tongue is Tamil".[73]

Perhaps the most telling invocation of literature and literary history for the purposes of this socio-political purpose could be seen in what Sundaram Pillai said:

> "Whatever else there exists or not of the ancient Dravidian civilization, there exists, the Tamil language with its various dialects, including the classical dialect now gone out of use and the extensive literature written in that dialect. A Critical study of this dialect and of this literature would certainly, under ordinary circumstances, be held as a pre-requisite for conducting south Indian antiquarian researches"[74]

In view of this supra-literary function of the literary history of Tamil, it is important for us to delineate in clear terms as far as possible, how this writing developed in this period.

In terms of intellectual history, this is a significant phase in Tamilnadu. First and foremost, there was the rediscovery of the ancient literary heritage; secondly there was a great interest shown in the history of the religion; thirdly and most importantly Caldwell's Magnum Opus, '*A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages*' (1856) led not only to new academic stimulation but to a socio-cultural euphoria. All these interacted with each other and brought in new sense of awareness not seen previously. (See Appendix I for the major writings on literary history).

The major breakthrough of this phase is the editing of the Cankam classics. The rediscovery of these works brought in a new sense of confidence to the Tamils. But this very rediscovery of the literary heritage should be seen against the background of what was going on in the field of historical studies, for, it was the timing of this literary discovery that mattered most.

Appendix II gives the details of the publication of the ancient and medieval literary works. Starting with *Tolkappiyam* Porulatikaram (1885) and *Kalittokai* (1887), both edited by C.W.Thamotherampillai the ancient texts were being brought out in fairly quick succession and by 1926, with the publication of Ainkurunuru, the Cankam corpus had become a part of the Gutenberg galaxy, indestructible. A major share in this great task was taken by U.V.Caminatha Iyer, who was single handedly responsible for the publication for five of the Cankam collections.

The printing of the Cankam texts had an immediate impact on the historiography of Tamils. Kanakasabhai Pillai, the author of *Tamils 1800 years ago*, a work that showed the world of the historical wealth of South India puts it thus:

> "The vast field of ancient Tamil Literature is like an unknown land into which no traveller hath yet set foot. Many of the ancient classical works in Tamil have recently seen the light .. . . It is the general opinion of western scholars that there was no Tamil Literature before the ninth century A.D. But the fact appears to be that all that was original and excellent in the literature of the Tamils was written before the ninth century and what followed was, for the most part, but a base imitation or translation or Sanskrit works. From a careful study of ancient Tamil poems, I am led to think that some of the earliest works were undoubtedly composed more than two thousand years ago . . . . The Augustan period of Tamil Literature, was I would say, in the first century of the Christian Era".[75]

A historian of slightly later time, K.G.Sesha Aiyar assesses the value of Cankam literature:

"Tamil Literature of the Sangam period is the oldest

native source that supplies relevant material for ancient South Indian History, for it is antecedent to the era of dated inscriptions related to the South Indian Kings. It is no exaggeration to say that it is impossible to repay the debt which the student of Tamil India owe to the venerable and learned Mahamohapadyaya (Caminata Iyer), by whose great work alone it had become possible to recover the outlines of the lost history of ancient South India and to gain some knowledge of the stage of civilization, the social, literary and the political life and the religious ideas of the Tamil people in the early centuries of the Christian era".[76]

Of course, there had been many problems and even disputes about the handling of these literary data as source for history[77] and as Nilakanta Sastri observed that the shortcomings of the colophons 'leave untouched the main question of the authority and correctness for purposes of history of the literary tradition we have been discussing'.[78]

These discoveries of the cultural richness of South India began to have the desired impact. Maxmuller, the man who was mainly responsible for the creation of the myth of Indo-Aryan supremacy, in the preface he wrote to his last work 'The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy', said:

"What we want are texts and translations and any information that can throw light on the chronology of Indian Philosophy. Nor should their labour be restricted to Sanskrit texts. *In the South of India there exists a philosophical literature which, though it may show clear traces of Sanskrit influences contains also original, indigenous elements of great beauty and of great importance for historical purposes.* Unfortunately few scholars only taken up, as yet, the study of the Dravidian languages and literature but young students who complain that

there is nothing left to do in Sanskrit literature, would, I believe, find their labours amply rewarded in that field".[79]

This is no doubt the impact of the good work J.M.Nallasamy Pillai and others were doing in highlighting the philosophical literatures found in Tamil.

Writings like this reveal the type of awakening, the printing of the old texts has created among the literratti.

With such awakening, it is not surprising that history of literature was beginning to emerge.

Of those efforts towards such a history, first mention should go to those important biographical works. As Wellek has shown in his *Rise of English History* biography of poets seems to be the first form of writing history of literature. *The Tamil Plutarch* written by[80] Simon Casie Chitty of Puttalam, Sri Lanka (1859) was evidently written for western consumption. Simon Casie Chitty tries to present to lives of the poets in terms of Western symbols (The Cankam as Senatus Academicus). The importance of his work, though deficient in many ways lies in that it is the first biography in English of Tamil poets.[81]

The other major biography of the period is Pavalar Carittira Theepakam written by Arnold Sathasivam Pillai.[82] This is also a biography of Tamil poets, names arranged in alphabetical order. The shortcomings of this work have been criticized, as could be seen in the recent edition brought of it, but the significance of the work lies in the fact that it has been written by a Christian Tamil teacher, also the editor of the famous Utayatarakai. Scholars like Arnold Sathasivam Pillai are Tamil scholars and working as Tamil pandits in an age and milieu (in Jaffna in the eighties of the last century) when Saivaism was considered synonymous

with Tamil and *vice versa*, they established the position that religion is no bar for them to be the inheritors of the great cultural legacy of Tamil. It is this insistence on the nativisation that soon made Christianity 'part and parcel' of the soil and led to works like those of G.S.Duraiswamy Pillai with the type of editorial comment it had.[83]

The other important biography, another one in Tamil again by an author from Jaffna, Kumaraswamy Pulavar, is important because that biography with all its faults, is the work of a traditional scholar.[84] This work which seems to have had the blessings of Pandithuraithevar follows the traditional norms in writing about a Pulavar's work (the definition of 'Pulavar) is such that it would include anyone from a poet to a commentator, demogogue or a preacher) but it is conscious also of the western norms of literary biography. This work reveals that the consciousness about literary heritage was not confined to the English educated people only; this is something we shall refer to later.

Besides these formal beginnings in the pursuit of writing history of literature, we have the beginnings of history of literature itself, conceived as a chronological narrative.

The earliest and perhaps the most significant is the introduction that John Murdoch has written to his *'Classified Catalogue of Tamil Books'* published in 1865.[85] It gives a detailed account of Tamil known at that time. The catalogue compiled by Murdoch and the notes he has given reveal his extensive knowledge and commitment to Tamil studies. V.S.Chengelvaraya Pillai's *History of Tamil Prose*, originally written as a dissertation for an M.A., degree and first published in 1904, deals very briefly with the entirety of the history of Tamil prose. This discussion on prose, from references to it in *Tolkappiyam* to the writings of

Arumuga Navalar, Sabapathy Navalar, Prof.Sundaram Pillai and Suria Narayana Sastriar has been done quite objectively.

It was left to M.S.Purnalingam Pillai, the prolific writer and the proto-type of the present day author of examination guides to write the first-history of Tamil Literature called *'A primer of Tamil Literature'* (1904). It is a very compact work and his periodization is indeed very thought provoking. He expands this work as *Tamil Literature* in 1929, making it perhaps the first examination oriented history of Tamil Literature. The question papers he gives as appendix to the book seems to have been a guide for later, better business minded professors of Tamil. The work reads more like a social history than literary history but the last eight chapters are basically literary history in that he tries to understand the community in terms of its literature, sometimes too literally.[86] Mention, however brief should be made of K.S.Srinivasa Pillai's *Tamil Varalaru.* It has been written in an enticingly argumentative way.

The next major group of writings connected with literary history are the history of Tamil and Tamilnadu written by scholars like S.Krishnaswamy Iyanger and P.T.Srinivasa Iyengar. Both these authors, though they had differences of opinion in handling the literary sources, made full use of the literary evidences found in Cankam literature to write standard histories which had appeal all over India. It was with the arrival of Nilakanta Sastri who put South Indian History on a firm footing, demanding from all historians of India a closer study of the developments in South India for a complete understanding of Indian culture as a whole, the problem of using Cankam literature as a source gets sorted out.

Though he seems to have changed his attitude later (see his *Culture of History of the Tamils*,--Calcutta, 1966) for no scientifically sustainable reason, he was

able to state at that time, the real use of Cankam literature as a source for Tamilian history. Writing in 1932 he said:

> "The linguist waits for the historian to settle the chronology of this literature without a knowledge of which the study of the growth in language is not feasible; the historian on the other hand, seeing how inconclusive the other lines of evidence are on this question, hopes for some conclusive results from the study of language development. We have therefore wait for a synthesis to be effected between the different lines of approach and for definite conclusions to emerge on the internal chronology of this literature".[87]

This is a clear exposition of the problems in handling Cankam Literature as history and this was exactly the task that was attended to in the next phase by scholars like S.Vaiyapuri Pillai.

As referred to earlier, this consciousness of the literary heritage and the desire to put it in its right perspective was not confined, in this phase, to the English educated scholars only. The world of traditional Tamil Saiva Siddhanta--learning responded to these changes very admirably, when Sabapathy Navalar wrote his *Dravida Prakasikai* in 1899. Reacting rather sharply to non-Saivaite interpretations of Tamil Literature, Sabapathy Navalar has delineated the grammatical, literary and the philosophical traditions that constitute the Tamilian heritage from the point of view of a Saiva Siddhantist.

It is interesting to note that *Pulavar Puranam* of Murugadasa Swamikal is a work on the biography of Tamil poets written in the style of a puranam. The book was printed first in 1901, with the assistance of Diwan Bahadur V.Krishnamachari.

Most significant of the responses from the world traditional Tamil learning is the one that emanates from the Tamil Sangam founded by Pandithuraithevar in 1901. The Journal of this Sangam *'Centamil'* started in 1903, published important contributions to the understanding of Tamil Literature and history. Scholars like Ra.Raghava Iyengar, M.Raghava Iyengar were associated with this institutions and the journal.

It is now getting clear that this was formative period of literary history in Tamil. Besides the effort to bring out in print the works available, there were also the attempts at dating them. As had already been noticed, better scientific approach towards the problem of dating was possible only after getting all the data possible, and availability, of such material was possible only in the next phase. But two controversies that took place during this phase underscored the necessity to have a clear idea of the order of the historical succession of the works.

It is ironical that both the debates were started by two reverend gentlemen who had contributed much toward Tamilian consciousness, Robert Caldwell and G.U.Pope.

Caldwell in his *'A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages'* had a history of Tamil Literature of some sort (in the chapter 'Antiquity of Dravidian Literature'[88] and mentioned therein that 'there is not anyone of them (Tamil Literature) older than the tenth century A.D.[89] and that Tirugnanasambandhar lived in the thirteenth century.[90]

Coming from much an authoritative person as the author of A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Language itself, the idea was being taken over by many western scholars. Dr.Burnell view that 'Tamil people had no literature till the 8th century A.D. and Tamil Literature was only an exact copy of Sanskrit works'

found its way into the stately columns of the Encyclopaedia Britannica'. Professor P.Sundaram Pillai took up the issue and voiced his opposition very emphatically.

> "It is surely possible to conceive greater confusion than that which prevails with reference to the age of Sambandha Mr.Taylor places Kun Pandya and therefore Sambandha also, who cured him, about 1320, B.C., while Dr.Caldwell contends that he was resigning in 1292 A.D. Thus it would appear possible to assign Sambandha to 1300 B.C. or A.D. indifferently. This is certainly very curious, and I am not sure whether we can find the like of it in the whole range of history. Indeed, it would seem that South Indian chronology has yet to begin its existence".[91]

Sundaram Pillai goes on to deal with this problem in detail and at the end of it, perhaps the first of the polemics (in English) on the question of dating Tamil Literature, he says "In conclusion, we may indicate, the main purpose subserved by this paper:

(1) It gives a bird's eye view of the sacred Tamil Literature of the Saivas.

(2) It shows the position of Sambandha as a Saiva saint and a lyrical poet and also as the first great adversary of Jainism in Southern India.

(3) It controverts the opinions of Dr.Burnell with regard to the antiquity and value of Tamil Literature.

(4) It shows the utterly confounded nature of the hypotheses advocated by Dr.Caldwell and Mr. Nelson with regard to the age of Sambandha.

(5) An attempt is made to trace an outline of the religious history of Southern India with a view

to fix the relative age of Sambandha, Sankara and Ramanjua.

(6) Facts are deduced to prove with the help on the latest archaeological researches that Sambandha could not have lived in any period later than the early years of the seventh century leaving the upper limit to be fixed by an inquiry into the age of Kocenganan".

No wonder the whole contribution marked an important milestone in the writing of the history of Tamil Literature.

The other controversy was relating to the date of Manickavasagar. Rev.Pope, in his introduction to the translation of the Tiruvacakam, said that Manickavasagar cannot have lived at a later period than the ninth (century)'.[92]

In another place in the same introduction (p.lxxv) Pope said that Manickavasagar 'may reasonably be assigned to the tenth century A.D. or earlier'. This was challenged by many and was argued that Manickavasagar belonged to a period prior to the Thevaram trio.

As we are aware later researches reveal that in the first case the local scholars challenge was proved correct, whereas in the second case it was Pope who was correct. Nonetheless the debate evoked much interest and scholars of the eminence of S.Krishnaswamy Iyengar (he replied to an article by Innis written in the Asiatic quarterly around 1900)[93] and Sesha Iyer took part in the debate.

It is useful to quote what Sesha Iyer had written on the question of the psychology behind this whole issue of dating the ancient works.

"It is a peculiar feature of South Indian literary history, that scholars still feel themselves at liberty to advance any date that fancy may might to any writer whatever, and it thus happens that a Tamil Poet whom one scholar assigns to the first century after Christ is unhesitatingly assigned by another to the 14th century after Christ; This curious phenomenon it will be impossible to come across anywhere in the whole field of history exception in Southern India. That the picture is by no means overdrawn will be evident when we place at the various dates assigned to Manickavasagar. It seems to be an almost understood rule or law that the tendency for the Indian scholar is to assign the great names that have enriched his literature to an early a period as well he can; and perhaps the reason for this may be sought in the general belief among us, not unnaturally induced by the glory and glamour of an ancient civilization that worth and antiquity go hand in hand. The tendency in the other hand of the European scholar is just the reverse. It is an article of his creed that the professed antiquity of Tamil Literature is only a pious fable and it is a settled fact with him that Tamil Literature grew and flourished only a few centuries ago. For has not Dr.Burnell, and Dr.Burnell ought to know best, issued the fiat that the earliest extant work in Tamil Literature cannot be older than the 8th century after Christ, and have not eminent scholars like Dr.Rost and Prof.Vinson accepted it without hesitation and even with docility? As a natural result of these conflicting tendencies the dates arrived at by Indians only serve in the eyes of the European to point the moral that the Indians are deficient in the historic sense, while the conclusions arrived at by Europeans are regarded by the Indians as only demonstrating their inborn disabuse and intolerance of his ancient civilization. Neither has confidence in the results arrived at by the other, though both avowedly pursue 'historical'

methods. There should certainly be vital difference in the very fundamental in which these historical inquiries are based to render such hopelessly irreconcilable results possible. To what extent faulty methods of investigation and the inevitable personal idiosyncracies are severally responsible for the divergent results that stare the student of South Indian literary history in the face, I do not pretend to be able to say, but to whatever cause the divergence may be due, the position thus created in extremely puzzling.[94]

This game of polarization mentioned by Sesha Iyer--antiquity as an article of faith on one side and inborn suspicion about any worth-while achievement on the other is the key to understand the controversies on the dating of the texts.

While we are on this question of dating we should acknowledge the great service performed by the various journals of this period--Madras Review, Indian Antiquary, Asiatic Quarterly, Tamilian Antiquary, Madras Christian College Review, Indian Magazine and Review, Siddhanta Deepika, Gnana Bothini, etc.

The polarization of opinion referred to above is an important one. While on the one hand this phase reveals the antiquity of Tamil Literature and the type of linguistic patriotism it develops, it also shows that there were intellectual responses which did not welcome very much this new awareness. Some of the responses like those of M.Srinivasa Iyengar, appreciated the significance of these discoveries but did not accept the position that it was completely free of Sanskrit influence. 'In Tamil there is no literature unconnected with ethics or religion and there is no ethics or religion in India without the Aryan Influence'.[95] This was of course a diplomatic way of saying. But there were other works quite learned in treatment which tried to cut the flow at the level of the fountain head itself.

R.Swaminata Iyer's contribution challenging Caldwell's thesis is important in this respect. He challenged Caldwell's theory of Dravidian Languages' on the ground that the theory is based on a mis-apprehension of the real facts of the case and is supported by assumptions some of which can be easily disproved.[96]

An important contribution to this debate was made by M.Seshagiri Sastri a figure almost forgotten in the annals of the historiography of Tamil literary history. His 'Essay on Tamil Literature' (1894) deals with the Cankam legend and says that 'Perhaps it was in imitation of such (Sanskrit) colleges that Tamil poets created their own Sangams and located them at Madura and other places'.[97] He was the first to refer to the Gajabahu Synchronism for the dating of Cilappatikaram (pp.30-33) and it was he who draw the attention of the world of scholarship to the Dramida Sangha mentioned in the Jaina book Digambara Darsana. He also exposed the caste ridden character of the contemporary non-Brahmin Tamil Pandits which led to the neglect of Valluvar on the basis of his low caste (p.17).

There was no possibility of any appeal for moderate views to be received sympathetically. In a way it was also not possible to expect a reasoned debate in that period when the process of rediscovery was on. Such a debate was possible only after the rediscovery of the entire literature and some scientific data on the historical evolution of the community. The next phase tries to achieve these.

V

If the foregoing phase was one of incubation, the thirties and the post thirties were one of growing-up. The period begins with the publication of Ka.Cuppiramania Pillai's '*Ilakkiya Varalaru* in Tamil. It is clear that by *Ilakkiya Varalaru* is meant both history of the development of literature and the history of the

people as seen through literature. Cuppiramania Pillai's preface is quite categorical about it.

> ''ஒரு மொழியின் இலக்கிய வரலாறானது அம்மொழியிலுள்ள செவ்விய நூல்களின் தோற்றத்தையும் தன்மையையும் கால முறைக்கேற்ப வகுத்துக்காட்டி அம்மொழி பேசும் மக்களது கருத்துக்கள், இலக்கியங்களுள் எம்முறையிலமைந்துள்ளன வென்றும் அவர்களது மண வாழ்க்கையின் வரலாற்றினை அவர்கள் இலக்கியங்கள் எவ்வாறு விளக்கிக் காட்டுகின்றன என்றும் தெரிந்து, இலக்கியமென்பது மக்கள் வாழ்க்கைப் படம் என்று தெரிவுற அறிவுறுத்தும் கருவி நூலாகும்'' 98

Literary history in Tamil has come up of age. But there were a few forbidding problems. First and foremost, there remained the great task of setting these works in their historical background and for that it was important to get the historical narrative of the region in clear perspective.

Before going into the question of relating literary knowledge to historical knowledge, it is equally important to remind ourselves of the major developments in the socio-political field and the consequent activities in literature.

In a way the thirties inaugurate a process of self-rule and the procedures for demanding and achieving it, which it could be said is going on even now. The political Independence India got in 1947 is only a step in that process. But it was a major step, a distinguishing landmark in the march towards full freedom. It is important that one is conscious of both the continuity of this process and the distinguishing landmark. This is at the national level.

At the regional level, in terms of the consciousness of the Tamil community, consciousness of its individuality

and its ultimate membership of the Indian tradition, there had been significant developments. In terms of political developments, the mid-thirties mark the fall of the Justice Party Government led to an intensification of the activities of the Communist Party, in the Tamil region, it was the Self-respect and the rationalist movement of E.V.Ramaswamy Naicker (1879-1973) that was gaining ground. The rationalist movement was not only atheistic, it was also quite critical of those who spoke of the historic glories of Tamil and Tolkappiyam,[99] Periyar E.V.Ramaswamy Naicker takes over the Justice Party and with the assistance of a person who was going to change the face of both that movement and the Tamilnadu itself C.N.Annadurai (1908-1969), forms the Dravidar Kazhagam in 1944, Periyar's uncomprising attitudes and Annadurai's able assessment of the situations led to the formation of the Dravida Munnetra kazhagam in 1949, just two years after independence. This date marks a radical departure in the socio-political consciousness of the Tamils especially in matters relating to their cultural legacy.

In view of these developments, it is suggested that the development in literary history of the post thirties is taken in two laps, the first one from 1930 to 1950 and the second one from 1950 to the seventies.

The need to take seventies as the lower limit is to indicate the new winds of change that are sweeping through the intellectual corridors of Tamilnadu. But, for reasons of historical propriety, only the major trends of the post-fifties will be indicated. The documentation of the publications of the post fifties too is not complete.

The rationale for taking the period. '1930-1950' as one unit for discussion here has already been given.

In terms of the struggle for Indian independence and the emergence of the all Indian national conscious-

ness that was both a result and cause of it, the thirties were a very important phase. The role of the historians in creating that all Indian unity and in creating visions of pre-colonial empires, as grand as if not grander than the British empire, has been delineated by scholars like Romila Thapar.[100] It was in the thirties that such a historiographical trend was seen in South India. A perusal in Appendix III of the work of authors like Ramachandra Dikshithar, Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Nilakanta Sastri, Minakshi, Mahalingam and Sathianathaiyer will demonstrate the truth of this position. Whereas on the one hand these studies, especially those of Nilakanta Sastri, helped to bring South India into the mainstream of Indian history, they also helped to give a clear and detailed picture of the history of the region by periods and dynasties. Works on the Pandyas, the Pallavas, the Colas, the Muslims, the Vijayanagara Kings, gave a full picture of the life and the events of the country, under the various dynasties. It, therefore, became easy to relate the literary works to the dynasties and periods. In fact the literatures themselves were very useful in shedding light on dynastic developments and individual achievements of kings. The spurt of historical writing on Tamilian history in English later leads to historical writings in Tamil itself. These doyen of such writers is T.V.Sadasivapandarattar. The trend, however, was set by T.N.Subramaniam, who was also a creative writer.

This type of concentration on research activities was possible only by institutional effort and the role of the University of Madras in this respect in the thirties was great. The names of two persons are very important in the research activities of this period. K.A.Nilakanta Sastri in history and S.Vaiyapuri Pillai in literature.

Mention should be made here of the manner Vaiyapuri Pillai set out his task as a literary scholar. It is true that Vaiyapuri Pillai is a much maligned figure,

especially in the sixties and seventies when he was openly decried as a traitor to the Tamil cause, the crime being that he brought down the dates of the Tamil texts and that he claimed Sanskrit influence for many Tamil literary works.[101] We shall have to assess Vaiyapuri Pillai's role as a literary historian. But right now what is needed is to show the manner he approached the study of Tamil literary history. His presidential address to the section on Dravidian Studies at the Nagpur Session (1946) of All India Orientalists Conference brought out in Tamil later, sets out the task of a literary historian thus.

இனி இலக்கிய வரலாற்றில் பல நூல்களுக்கும் பல ஆசிரியர் களுக்கும் காலம் துணியப்படுதல் அவசியம். இதனைத் தனிப்பட்ட ஒரு பகுதியாகக் கொள்ளலாம். இலக்கிய ஆசிரியர்களின் தனி வரலாறுகளும் ஆசிரியர் வரலாற்று அகராதிகளும் இங்கே கருதத்தகும். பின்னர் பொதுப்பட்ட இலக்கிய வரலாறுகள் இயற்றப்படல் வேண்டும். இதன் கண்ணே நூல் வகைகள், பண்டை, நடு, தற்காலம் இவற்றிற்குத் தனிப்பட உரிய இலக்கிய வரலாறுகள் முதலியவற்றைக் கொள்ளலாம். நூல் வகைகள் என்ற பகுப்பில் கவிதை, நாடகம், காவியம், கதை முதலியவற்றை அடக்குதல் வேண்டும். இலக்கிய அகராதியும் (dictionary of literature) பெரிதும் பயன்படுவ தாகும். நமது மொழிகளில் முக்கியமாகத் தமிழில், சரித்திரத்துக்குதவும் பொருட் கூறுபாடுகள் பல இருக்கின்றன. சிலாசாசனங்கள், தாமிர சாசனங்கள், தினசரிதைகள் முதலியவற்றை இங்கே குறிப்பிடலாம். இவற்றை நாம் கூடிய விரைவில் ஆராய்ச்சி செய்தல் வேண்டும். சரித்திர காலத்துக்கு முற்பட்ட வரலாறுகளைத் தெரிந்து கொள்ளப் புராண இதிகாசங்கள், நாடோடிப் பாடல்கள் முதலியன பயன்படும். பழமொழிகள் உலக வசனங்கள் முதலியனபற்றிய ஆராய்ச்சியும் தனிப்பட்ட ஒரு துறையாகும். வைத்தியம், சோதிடம் முதலியனபற்றிய ஆராய்ச்சியும் தனிப்பட்ட பொருள் வரலாற்று ஆராய்ச்சிகளும் இங்கே கருதற்குரியன. சமுதாய வரலாறு, நாகரிக வரலாறு, சமய வரலாறு, மாந்திரிக வரலாறு முதலியனவெல்லாம் வெவ்வேறு தனித்தனித் துறையாகக் கொள்ளத்தக்கன்."[102]

It is another question whether he was able to achieve all this, but this is to indicate how he viewed the subject and helped to develop it. He was an editor

of the Tamil Lexicon from 1926 to 1938 and head of the department of Tamil, University of Madras from 1938 to 1946 and even a quick glance at the bibliographical list of the literary history of the period will show the number of books that have emerged through his guidance or supervision or advice.

It is significant to note that during 1930-1949 the writings of those scholars we held views contrary to that of Vaiyapuri Pillai and Nilakanta Sastri were not coming in equal strength--in quality and quantity. Of course, in the fifties their writings, are very much in the picture. There were two significant writers both connected with Annamalai University. They are Ra.Raghava Iyengar, the author of Tamil Varalaru (1941) and Navalar Somasundara Bharathiyar[103] Maraimalai Atikal also continues to work in this period. But from the point of view of taking forward the discipline and doing intensive work on the periods, the works and the authors, the work inspired by Vaiyapuri Pillai deserves closer look.

The relative paucity of the views of the Tamil partisans during this time raises a matter of great significance and that is the role of the Tamil Scholar in the national struggle of the thirties.[104] We know that the thirties were a turbulent period. Vaiyapuri Pillai, a Rao-Saheb title holder himself (the title was given for his services as editor of the lexicon) was not politically active. But he reveals a nationalistic consciousness.[105] The other great scholar was Thiru V.Kalyanasundara Mudaliyar and it is no wonder that the Vaiyapuri Pillai's edition of Cankam Literatures came as a publication of the Saiva Siddhanta Maha Samajam (1940), an institution with which Thiru Vi Ka was intimately associated. But Thiru Vi Ka was not a scholar in the field of literary history. Poet Desikavinayagam

Pillai a resident of Travancore had an interest in archaeology and history also was a friend of Vaiyapuri Pillai.[106]

The scholars in the Tanittamil movement had a pro-British bias notably Maraimalai Atikal.[illegible] The self-respect movement at the start was not able to attract the traditional Tamil scholar because of its atheistic ideology. The traditional Tamil Scholar, with pre-conceived notions about the antiquity of the Tamils was not very much in the picture. The Tamil scholar begins to assume an ideological importance only with the rise of the DMK (1949) not so much during the heyday of the self-respect movement. This involvement starts in the fifties. It was only when the impact of Vaiyapuri Pillai was being felt that they rose in opposition. A perusal of Vaiyapuri Pillai's writings would reveal that what were published in book form in the early fifties were really articles or introductions to works which he had written earlier between 1936 and 1946.[107] It was with the formation of the DMK that Tamil literary history becomes a focal point of political activisation for the Tamil masses. This of course does not mean, as emphasized earlier, that during 1930-50 the other opinion had no voice at all. There was one scholar of repute, Somasundara Bharathi, whose writings represent this viewpoint. His commentary on Tol.Porulatikaram reveals his legalistic skill and literary thoroughness. His papers 'Tamil Classics and Tamilakam', 'Age of Tolkappiyam' are important.[108]

Having seen the general intellectual forces at work during this span of time, we could now get on to the character of the writings on literary history and how they were brought forth.

As referred to earlier, the dominant feature is the large number of historical writings which unravelled the socio-economic and political condition of Tamilnadu throughout the age. Nilakanta Sastri's *'Studies in Cola*

History and administration', 'Colas', Minakshi's excellent work on the Pallava period, T.V.Mahalingam's work in the Vijayanagara Period, Sathianathaiyer's work on the Nayaks cleared upto a great extend the problems of historical chronology of Tamilnadu. The complementary disciplines of history, archaeology and epigraphy also received much attention and the writings of K.R. Srinivasan, T.N.Subramaniam and Mu.Raghava Iyengar are important, Raghava Iyengar's *Cacanattamil Kavicaritram'* is of great importance to literary historical studies.

The intellectual stimulation produced and the intensive researches undertaken enabled the publication of literary histories. Some were studies on particular periods (T.N.Thanu Ammal, Pirkala Colar Kala Ilakkiyam--University of Madras, 1934), some were on individual poets (V.Venkatarajalu Reddiar's studies on Kapilar and Paranar) and some history by centuries (celebrated writing of Somasundara Desikar on the 16th and 17th centuries; the one on 16th century (1936) carries a forward by Vaiyapuri Pillai, in which he gives a brief history of literature of the period). There were two histories of Tamil Literature from the religious point of view both by Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy (Christianity, 1938, Buddhism, 1940). If Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy's works emphasized the multi-religious character of Tamil literature, Kaneca Aiyer's *Eelanattuppulavar Carittiram* (1939) demonstrated the multi-territorial character of Tamil language and literature. It was a work on Sri Lankan Tamil poets.

This phase also sees the expansion of the bulk of medieval texts in Tamil. The work of Vaiyapuri Pillai alone is enough to prove the point.

The relative lack of important works in the sphere of rigorous academic research in this field of studies by the traditional scholars is well compensated in the

role they play in the popularization of the literary heritage of the Tamils undertaken by perhaps the major publisher in Tamilnadu, The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, Tinnevely Ltd. It started a system of publication by which a series of lectures held on a particular text was published later. This publication series started with the Cankam texts and went down to the minor literatures of the late medieval period. The printing history of the series (See Appendix IV) demonstrates the popularity these lectures had with the Tamil readers.

This information is quite significant because it was after and along with such popularization of Tamil Literature that the DMK could launch on a propaganda move for their political cause citing the literature for the glorious past of the Tamils and contrast it with the poverty ridden Tamilnadu of the fifties.

So, while at one level there was intensive intellectual activity in this field, at the other level there was also an effort at extensive popularization.

It would be most appropriate to conclude the activities of this phase with a reference to P.S.Subramanya Sastri's *Historical Tamil reader* published (1945) by the Annamalai University. The significance of Sastri's work lies in that it had enough textual material with indisputable knowledge about the dates that he could arrange it in that order and trace the development of the Language' in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax and semasiology. Whatever may be the inadequacies of the work, the fact that it was possible to write it, meant that Tamil had adequate material to place in order for a linguistic and literary history.

The next 'unit' of time in the post-thirties is the fifties and the ensuing twenty to twenty five years. As stated already, this is too near for historical analysis yet too valuable to be left without mention. As such

it is intended to delineate only the trends and not go in for a discussion of personalities.

The fifties and the post-fifties exhibit a mature development of the study of Tamil literary history. The main reason for this development is the attention Dravidian studies began to receive at the hands of non-Indian scholars of human cultural history. Having been convinced of the importance of the pre-Aryan and non-Aryan elements in the evolution and the constitution of what is now known as Indian culture, scholars began their search for those traits. It was no surprise that what has been termed as 'Dravidian Characteristics' attracted their attention. Archaeology went a long way in creating this interest.

The emerging science of linguistics also began to show its interest in the Dravidian languages. Here again an intensive analysis of the Dravidian languages was found necessary for a study of not merely Indian languages but for a study of the entire south and south east Asian region.

Above all was the historical reality that Tamil was the only Indian language with the longest history of continuity in Indian history. And for any student interested in the history of Indian thought and culture, a study of Tamil was almost compulsory.

To add to all these intellectual arguments, there was a growing political necessity, big powers saw in Independent India the rise of certain features, which nobody could have suspected if they had taken the history of the pre-independence era as only the era for the struggle for independence under the leadership of Gandhi and Nehru. For one, soon after independence there came upon the scene a man called Canjeevaram Nataraja Mudaliyar Annadurai who with his rhetoric that politicised the entire Tamil culture, cutting of his umbilical links with his mentor Erode Ramasamy

Naicker and forming a party known as Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam. The best was yet to come, the person who undertook to meet the 'Dravidian' onslaught was not a man from the higher social echelons of the Tamil society; he was a Nadar from Virudupatti now called Virudhunagar. Kumaraswamy Nadar Kamaraj Nadar emerged as an all India figure, but had to accept defeat from a DMK student leader. The American and the British scholars felt that until then they have not been following these clues to understand the 'other' India. For the political bosses in Whitehall that Washington, a thorough brief on Nehru's India with details of its sources of irritation was quite needed.

All these cumulatively led to an interest in Tamilnadu, its society, its politics, its language, its anthropology, etc., Study-grants and fellowships began to be of great help to those scholars with intellectual quest to solve some problems in Indian and South Asian history.

While there was an international intellectual opinion developing, interested in knowing more of Tamil, Tamil nadu and Dravidian Civilization, there was also growing among the Tamils, in the context of political independence, a desire to academically establish their ethnic identity and cultural individuality; and the Tamils were not confined to India and Sri Lanka alone. They were living in areas ranging from the Caribean Islands to Malaysia. The formation of the International Association of Tamil Research was an academic fulfilment of this urgent socio-cultural need. The emerging international quest for truth and the ethnic thirst for recognition could now meet in real intellectual earnest. And thus was born the new international interest in Tamil studies.

But the attraction of the Western intellectual to Tamil studies led to one problem. When they came in they found to their surprise that the movement they wanted to study and the culture they wanted to understand had not produced much about itself based on

acceptable western methodology. They found that the works were either too Aryan oriented or Dravidian biassed.

It is at this juncture that we have to make an assessment of Vaiyapuri Pillai for he was one who developed a strict methodology to study Tamil Literature and its texts. Any research which based itself on the empirical method, the availability of unassailable evidence, led to politico-cultural judgements which hurt the feelings of some of the emerging, ethnically conscious Tamil literatti. But they had no answer for his methodology. It soon led to bitter attacks on him as a Tamil traitor. In the context of the above mentioned international interest, the understanding of Vaiyapuri Pillai becomes an academic necessity.

It is, therefore, important for us to look into the problem of assessing his significance, before we get on to delineate the trends of developments in the fifties and the post-fifties.

Vaiyapuri Pillai's position has been very clearly stated in his later works like *Kavya Kalam*. His position was:

> "In our eagerness to parade on patriotism in all its glory, we write and say things which are very far from the truth. Facts are nothing, evidences are mere game pieces on a chess board and the only thing cared for is the glorification of our country, people, language and literature. We must resist this alluring temptation with all our might. This tendency defeats its main purpose and we become objects of ridicule. Truth must be our sole aim and facts must guide our steps and govern our conclusions".[109]

This is how it should be. But in trying to find

the truth, the methods of application also matters. It is quite clear from the obituary notices written on him, especially the one by T.P. Meenakshisundaram, the more he was attacked the more he tended to withdraw himself from participation in public affairs.[110] He began to apply certain rules very inflexibly and with vengeance. As Professor V.I.Subramoniam, one of those who worked with him during his last days, says this rigorous application had within itself a scientific flaw.

> "He (Vaiyapuri Pillai) also made extensive use of parallels between Sanskrit and Tamil works in order to determine the dates. His dating of Tirukkural and Tolkappiyam are two instances of this approach. He could not persuade himself to believe that those passages in Tolkappiyam were later interpolations without proof of the type acceptable to textual critics. Nor did he agree to the possibility that the ideas found in Sanskrit works were adopted from Tamilnadu without a rigorous history of ideas. He may at times sound axiomatic. But his respect for facts is beyond reproach. A realization that these evidences are of secondary nature and if other plausible reasons are available, these have to be relegated as important anecdotes might have helped him to date those works topologically".[111]

The present writer had occasion to analyse in detail Vaiyapuri Pillai's dating of Cilappatikaram. It was found that Vaiyapuri Pillai's insistence that Cil., must have come after works like *Palamoli*, *Pancatantra* cannot be maintained. It was also found that whereas he was so careful in finding the historical use of words, (the centuries in which they were used), he was not equally attentive to the socio-historical conditions of the age.[112] His rigorous methodology applied with the spirit of historical materialism would have paid better results. But these would not deny the effectiveness of his approach. The most apt assessment yet

of Vaiyapuri Pillai's dating is that of V.I.Subramoniam, when he says:

> "Abundant proofs are now available to confirm his serialisation but not his dates.[113]

Vaiyapuri Pillai looms large in any study of the literary history of the Tamils. But for him we would not have been able to place the literary works in an order of historical development.

Vaiyapuri Pillai was attacked bitterly but was never replied scientifically and adequately. He made it impossible for future researchers to be unmindful of scientific historical data; with him there were no *a priori* assumptions and affectational conclusions. He went strictly by the evidence. That was both his strength and weakness. Having seen the importance of Vaiyapuri Pillai, it now remains to us to itemise the major developments in the study of literary history in the fifties and the post-fifties.

The most important feature of this phase is the recognition of history of Tamil Literature as a compulsory curricular course for the B.A. degree in the South Indian Universities. Thanks to the foresight of the late Professor K.Kanapathi Pillai, history of literature was introduced was a part of the Tamil course for both the general and the Tamil special courses of the University of Ceylon in the forties itself. V.Chelvanayakam, who had taken the classes mostly, feeling the need for a text book and being equipped to write such a work, wrote his *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru* which attempted to give the history of Tamil Literature against the background of the political developments of the Tamilnadu. Thus periods which were earlier known as *Samanar Kalam*, *Thevara Kalam* and *Saivakkappiya Kalam* were now know as *Cankam Maruviya Kalam*, *Pallava Kalam*, *Colapperumannar Kalam* and *Vijayanagara Nayakkamannar Kalam*. Scholars from

Vaiyapuri Pillai to Jesudasan and Arunachalam have recognized the merit of Chelvanayakan's work. It soon became the pattern for the other text books. Subsequent textbook writers, as textbook writers normally do and have got to do, took over his periodisation without acknowledgement.

The introduction of history of literature as part of the Tamil curriculum, though it inescapably led to textbooks and 'guides' which oversimplified the basic tenets of the discipline, created a major consciousness at student level.

The emergence of this interest at the level of under-graduate studies was contemporaneous with the awakening of the interest history of Tamil Literature among the Westerners. This leads to the publication of important studies on Tamil culture and history in the Western languages.

The impact of the Westerners interest brought new intellectual dimensions to Tamil studies. Scholars like Basham and Filliozat saw Tamil in a wider context. Basham saw Tamilian culture and its contributions as playing a major role in the 'Wonder that was India',[114] Filliozat never saw 'Tamil in isolation and always studied Tamil culture not only in its all-India but all-Asian dimensions . . . . . If some Tamil scholars view his translation of *Tiruppavai* or *Tirumurukarruppatai* as too much influenced by Sanskritic approach, they should remember that, in fact, the Hindu culture is one and that, on the other hand, Prof.Filliozat has very often acted as an eye-opener for Sanskritists who had till recently, a natural tendency to ignore the Tamil contribution to Hinduism and that he is also one of the few scholars to trace Tamil influence in South East Asia'.[115] George L.Hart's study of Tamil Literature in relation to the literary aesthetics of Sanskrit literature,[116] is also an important one.

68-6

Kamil Zvelebil's contribution to the study of the history of Tamil Literature should be noted. With his extensive and intensive knowledge of Tamil, he has written three books, one an over-all survey of Tamil Literature (The Smile of Murugan on Tamil Literature of South India-Leiden-1973), the second an exhaustive study of the development of literature and how it has been studied (Tamil Literatue--Leiden 1975--in the series--Hand bunch der Orientalistik) and the third Tamil Literature (in the series--History of Indian Literature (Vol. x) welsbaden--1974) in which 'Tamil Literature is classified as previously not by Time, but by specifically literary types of organisations of structure. It is viewed as a simultaneous order with the interpretation and analysis of the works of literature themselves(p.2). These, alongwith his book on the Siddha poets (Poets of Power--London) have provided the Western student of Tamil Literature a very comprehensive account of Tamil Literature.

The effort of the French scholars (L'Inde Classique-1953) and the contributions of the Russian Scholars Rudin and Andronov have contributed to the better understanding of Tamil and have earned wider audiences for Tamil language and literature.

The non-Tamilian interest in Tamil literary history led Tamil scholars to engage themselves in presenting Tamil Literature in its historical perspective in English. The most important of such writings are :

1956-S.Vaiyapuri Pillai -- *History of Tamil Language and Literature* -- Madras.

1961-C&H Jesudasan -- *A History of Tamil Literature* -- Calcutta.

1965-T.P.Meenakshisundaram -- *A History of Tamil Literature*, Annamalai Nagar.

1965-X.S.Thaninayagam -- *Landscape and Poetry* -- London.

1966-N.Subramaniam -- *Sangam Polity* -- Oxford.

1967-A.K.Ramanujan -- *The Interior Landscape* -- Indiana.

1968-K.Kailasapathy -- *Tamil Heroic Poetry* -- Oxford.

1974-M.Arunachalam -- *An Introduction to the Study of the History of Tamil Literature* -- Tiruchitrampalam.

1981-N.Subramanian -- *An Introduction to Tamil Culture* -- C.L.S.

1981-K.Sivathamby-- *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*-- Madras.

Of these Kailasapathy's work has seen the Cankam corpus in relation to the heroic bardic literatures of Greece and thus widened the horizons of Tamil literary study. If a comparison with Homer has provide a new dimension to early Tamil poetry, '*Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*', studying Tamil drama in relation to the Greek Drama, showed how and why theatre did not develop as a great cultural institution among the Tamils.

While these efforts have been catching the attention of the non-Tamilian scholarship the efforts in Tamil have been equally important.

Of the work done, in Tamil the most noteworthy activities in this field come from the Universities.

Viewed chronologically the project started at Annamalai University deserves mention. The project for

a comprehensive history of Tamil Literature, started under the Vice-Chancellorship of K.V.Reddy ended up with the publication of five rather disjointed volumes. T.V.Sadasiva Pandarathar, the resourceful scholars, wrote two of the volumes (one on 13th, 14th & 15th centuries and the other on the period 250-600 A.D. both in 1955) Vellaivaranar wrote one on Tolkappiyam (1957). C.S.Varadharasa Iyer wrote a history of Tamil Literature from 1 to 1100 A.D. in terms of the Jaina, Buddhist and Vaisnava contributions (1957). The fifth volume on History of Saiva Literature from 7th to 10th century was written by Avvai Duraiswamy Pillai (1958).

These studies reveal the absence of an overall policy and editorial supervision that are essential for such undertakings. Besides, the manner the areas had been chalked out for treatment leave much to be desired. For instance, when Saiva literature of 7th to 10th centuries A.D. were taken up for treatment in one volume, Vaisnava literature which is so much an integral part of Tamil cultural expression has been treated as one among Buddhist and Jaina literatures.

The overall policy that was absent in the case of Annamalai is very much present in the effort of the Kerala University in the sixties when its Department of Linguists undertook to systematically index the major literatures in Tamil according to standards set in linguistics.[117] This was not history of literature, nor literary history, but as Vaiyapuri Pillai suggested, it was the sheet anchor for a comprehensive history of literature in terms of the development of the language.

With the shift of emphasis of the Kerala University to wider Dravidian Linguistics intensive studies in literary history were taken up at the newly founded Madurai University, later Madurai Kamaraj University, with a more flexible name board to assist them. Dept.

of Studies, instead of the traditional 'Dept. of Tamil'. The Madurai University under the leadership of Professor M.Shanmugam Pillai took up to literary historical studies of modern, medieval and ancient literatures.

This is perhaps the most-appropriate juncture to refer to the 'Tamil Ph.D., explosion' in Tamilnadu. With the type of financial assistance provided and the institutional provisions made for post graduate studies, it should be possible to develop research in a more meaningful manner if there is a clear view of the subject priorities for research and a proper survey of the resource personnels available for guiding research. As it stands, there is bound to be repetition of work and waste of manpower resources.

The role of the Universities in Sri Lanka and of Malaysia in the development of Tamil literary history is very important.

Reference has already been made to the pioneer role of the University of Ceylon and of K.Kanapathi Pillai and V.Chelvanayakam in the very formulation of the discipline as a curricular course. Kanapathi Pillai pioneered the study of Tamil inscriptions; his study of the Tamil inscriptions of the 7th and 8th centuries at London in 1935 was the first of it kind. Chelvanayakam also wrote a History of Tamil Prose (1957), a work as important as his History of Tamil Literature. Vithiananthan's *Tamil Calpu* is a very important contribution to the study of Cankam society and its literature. Uwise's work on Muslim Tamil Literature was done at the University of Ceylon.

University of Ceylon produced a group of scholars in the fifties, who began specialising in the various branches of Tamil study. The work of Velu Pillai (study of Tamil inscriptions) Kailasapathy, Thillainathan, Sivathamby (literary criticism and literary history) contributed to the development of literary history. Perhaps

the most significant contribution of the scholars working in the different Universities of Sri Lanka is the work they have done on Tamil inscription in Sri Lanka. The writings of the late S.Thananjayarajamugham (on Arumuga Navalar) and of P.Poolasingham (on the Tamil literary figures of Sri Lanka) deserves special mention. Besides the writings of Kailasapathy and of this writer, the writings of M.A.Nuhman Chitralekha Maunaguru and Kalaiarasi Chinniah are very important. University of Jaffna, in its Department of Tamil, conducts methodical survey of the folk and the classical Tamil literary wealth of Sri Lanka.

University of Malaya, since the time of Thaninayagam, has fostered a tradition of Socio-cultural approach to Tamil literary studies. Thaninayagam's own works (Landscape and Poetry; Humanism in Tamil Literature) and the writings of S.Singaravelu (on Cankam Society) and Devapoopathi Nadaraja, Loganayaki Vannithamby have an important place in studies in Tamil literary history. Even though the first comprehensive history of Tamil Literature in Malaysia and Singapore has been written by a non-University man, the work done by the members of the department of Indian studies, notably R.Dhandayutham, is of substantial interest.

Of the most important developments in the study of literary history in the post fifties three deserve mention:

(a) literary history of the different regions like Chettinadu, Kedilakkarai, Kongunadu etc.

(b) the development of the various literary genres, novel, short story, new poetry, drama, stalapurana ballads, pallu, Kuravanci, Kavyas.

(c) literary history by centuries. There is only one scholar who has undertaken this task--Mu.Arunachalam.

This type of development has especially helped the development of modern literature. In modern literature, criticism is more immediate and pungent as creative writers themselves are largely involved in criticism.

A notable feature of the development in the development of literary history is the importance given to folklore studies. The processes of democratisation and secularization have led to greater attention being paid to folklore as source for classical literature. The role of the Universities in this field has been very significant.[119]

The fifties and the post fifties saw the development of literary studies based on the concept of historical materialism. This approach integrated literature to social development and the application of this method ranges from the Cankam to the modern periods. The late N.Vanamalai had been responsible for popularizing this approach in Tamilnadu. Marxian literary criticism in Tamil has been developed by T.M.C.Raghunathan, K.Kailasapathy, K.Sivathamby and G.Kesavan.

An important feature of fifties is the interest shown in the Tamil literary history of Sri Lanka and Malaysia and integrating them into the literary development of Tamil as a whole.[120]

III

THE PROBLEMATICS OF TAMIL LITERARY HISTORY

I

The foregoing attempt to trace the development of the writings on literary history, especially histories of literature, which constitute the foundation for it shows the changing concepts of literary history and of literature itself, also of what constitutes criticism etc... It also reveals that no major attempt has been made, as for instance done during the days of the compilation of the Tamil Lexicon, and the preparation for the *Kalaikkalanciyam*, the encyclopaedia in Tamil to gather in one centralised place persons and materials to write a comprehensive history of Tamil Literature. We also saw that the attempt made at Annamalai University was ill-planned, poorly executed and has ended up as just additional material on matters already written and not works which supercede existing works.[1] The main reason for this failure has been the lack of an overall policy and co-ordinated planning.

A work of that size and dimension falls very well within the purview of an institution like the Tamil

University. No history could be accepted as the history of Tamil Literature but such an attempt should aim at being more than an *another* history of Tamil Literature.

The facts of the preceding paper also reveals to us that whatever work has been done has been taken as individual or joint projects; and that those who worked on it had to confront the problems of writing a history of literature as they were working on it.[2] An analysis of these works reveal explicitly and implicitly the types of problems they faced in completing the task.

It is not proposed, in this chapter, to go in for criticism of individual works or writers. But a combined reading of these works and authors do provide an insight into what constitute the problems, i.e., the problematics of writing literary history. The main task here will be to go into them.

It is equally necessary to take up for discussion, along with this task, the things not done so far in the various studies on literary development, which are, nonetheless important for writing a proper history of Tamil Literature and literary history of Tamil.

The major question in writing a literary history is the need to clarify the position relating to the representativeness of the literatures we have for the pre-1300 period, so that we could work on a literary history on the basis of that literature.

There is of course the basic question whether we have all the Tamil Literatures said to have been composed and/or produced. Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy in his celebrated work on the lost works has given a comprehensive account of the works lost and how they have been lost.[4] *The question here is, to repeat, the representativeness of those literature, which we think we have recovered fully.* A perusal of the names

of the works reported lost shows that except for a few, their loss would not seriously affect recounting a substantial development of Tamil Literature. The question therefore is of the character of the literatures which we think we have recovered in full and is now in our possession. The second question, equally important, is to see whether we have brought in all the available Tamil writings in attempting to write both the history of Tamil Literature and literary history of the Tamil.

We have already seen that almost all of the Cankam texts we have, are those consciously preserved by a planned effort on the part of those in authority. We have the names of those who commissioned and were commissioned. We also know that there is a sort of a basis, the number of lines of the poem, for anthologizing. The question is, *are the poems that we have in the collections now were all that were available for compilation?* Could there have been the possibility of some poems being left out because of some policy decisions, about which we know nothing now, of the one who commissioned the compilation?

Tolkappiyam has provided enough clues to raise these doubts. In *Ceyyuliyal* we find reference works which have a length limit and those which have no limit of length *(Ceyyuliyal,* 63). They are *Nul* (Treatises), *Urai* (Prose), *Pici* (Riddles), *Mutumoli* (Proverbs), *Mantiram* (Magical utterances), *Kurippu* (Satire or it could even be charms), and *Pannatti* (Lyrics) we do not have instance of many of these in the preserved literature. Those preserved are largely of the *akam* and *puram* type. Of that, the preserved *akam* poems are in a metre *(Akaval)* not referred to as, at least, the most suitable for that. The suitable metres, it is said are *Kali* and *Paripattu (Akattinai Iyal,* 53). Even the poems collected under *akam* theme have a strong political bias.[5] All these, raise the question, whether we are basing our historical deductions on an anthology which was highly selective and not representing the entire literary produc-

tion. The highly schematized anthologies seem to indicate that they are more selections and not collections.

At least one point can be made. The present anthology tends to give the impression of a high sense of cordiality in the patron-client relationship the kings and the bards have had. But a stray poem in *Purananuru* (புறநானூறு) in which the poet who refuses to accept the 'Commercially sent' prize without giving him a proper audience, indicates that there were tensions, which we should take note of.

The vital question arising out of the traditional account relating to commissioning the compilation of anthologies is whether there was any censorship involved in the compilation. This is a crucial question to Tamil literary history. The question is well justified to be raised, because we have already seen how state patronage and intervention had led to the salvaging of the Bhakthi hymns which otherwise would have been lost. Reference has already been made to the extremely pro-establishment character of the pre-1300 century literature. The post-1300 literature is quite heterogeneous, the poetry of the siddhas, folk forms arising from the lowliest of the society -- the *pallas* and the *kuravas* being used to subserve the temple system, the openly hostile poems of certain poets against some of the state backed poets (e.g. those of Kalamekam), the literature of the mutts and the commentarial works desperately fighting to show the 'present significance of past works'. The literature of the 600-1300 era does not reveal such mixed character. It is large but homogeneous. The post-1300 literature neither large nor stupendous .

II

This underlines the need for an ideology oriented literary history of Tamil. As N.Subramanian says 'a departure from the common pattern (is) over due'.[6]

But none of the new attempts seem to provide the necessary. Literary history should be able to trace out for us the dominant ideologies of the various periods of Tamilnadu and how literature was used to promote that ideology at one stage and discredit it at another.

III

The subsequent question is equally important. What is the type of 'literature' we have taken as basis for literary history? Definition of literature is important here. Tamil Lexicon gives two important meanings, இலக்கணமுடையது, "that one written/composed according to certain norms" and சான்றோர் நூல், "the work of great men." We have evidently taken only the creative literary works as the basis of literary history. In *Ceyyuliyal* of *Tolkappiyam*, in the *cuttiram* we have already seen literature includes even *mantirams* (magical utterances). Our histories of Tamil Literature have depended largely on the creative works. Saiva Siddhanta texts and the consequent Pandara Sastras are the major exception. The various commentaries on Nalayira Divya Prabhanda did not receive Tamil literary sanction because they were in manippravala style.

If literary history is to provide the history of thought of that community, non-literary texts are of great importance.

> "Literature evolves in society as do, say houses, tools and political parties. Hence literature has close relations in non-imaginative writing, and by considering them, especially where they start to evolve into Literature proper, we can grasp literature more fully just as we can understand man better by considering apes and ape-men"[7]

Hence David Craig speaks of the need to study these non-literary writings which help us to understand literature proper.

In the case of Tamil we have to start further ahead. Tamil writings on medicine, astronomy, astrology, architecture, dancing, agriculture have not yet been codified properly yet and historians of Tamil Literature have not yet with the possible exception of. M.Arunachalam, who very hesitantly refers to the need of integrating them into history of Literature proper,[8] integrated them into the history of Tamil Literature. But some of the chapters in the different volumes in the histories of English Literature published by the Oxford and the Cambridge Universities are very revealing.

Oxford History of English Literature (ed-John Buxton Norman Davis)

English Literature in the earlier Seventeenth Century (1600-1660)--by Douglash Bush

Chapter II-Popular Literature of Translation
" VII--History and Biography
" VIII--Political Thought
" IX--Scientific Thought

Cambridge History of English Literature

Vol. XII - Chapter VI - Review and Magazines in the early years of the 19th Century.

Vol. VIII - Chapter XV - The Progress of Science.

Vol. XIV - Chapter VIII - The literature of Science
(a) Physics and Mathematics
(b) Chemistry
(c) Biology

Vol. XI - Chapter XIV - Book Production and Distribution 1625 - 1800.

Chapter XVI-Childrens Books.

The sociology of Tamil Literature reveals that the Caste-Character of arts has led to the ostracism of certain writings from the literary field also it has prevented getting them out from a limited circle. Right from the Cankam times there had been a tendency to consider literature as a high art. This could be seen in the manner the bards (panar) were discredited. Under Jaina and Buddhist hegemony, literature becomes a monastic discipline. There is a certain amount of intellectual austerity connected with the practice of the poetic art ever since. Further the traditions governing the practice of medicine had effectively ruled out a wider circulation of those texts. In fact, the language used in the books on medicine is highly coded, so much so a person who is not initiated into the science cannot understand it. As we come to the modern period, we cannot fail to notice that it is yet impossible to write of a history of technical terms in Tamil, which today are very much a part of the Tamilian expression. Not a single history of Tamil Literature has given an account of the growth of scientific literature in Tamil. As long as we do not do it, Tamil literary history would be no index to the Tamilian thought.

IV

The pattern of the study of the religious literatures of the various Tamil speaking groups deserves closer analysis. Reference has already been made to the Saivaite hegemony in the literary history of Tamil. Given the socio-political backing Saivaism had in the history of Tamilnadu it was inevitable.

The general tendency has been to take the Jaina, the Buddhist, the Muslim and the Christian writings in Tamil as contributions of the respective groups to Tamil. With Jainism commanding only a few adherents and Buddhism almost none one could get away with

a statement like that. But with the Muslims and the Christians two formidable religious groups (in fact the only two religious groups with a truly international spread) this characterization could be misleading. If we accept the position that literary formation is part of social formation and that literature is an essential aspect of social practice, then Tamil Christians need Tamil and cannot establish and express their religiosity in any linguistic expression other than Tamil. It would be most unscientific to consider those writings which are so integral to the practice and the consolidation of their faith as 'contribution' to Tamil. The term 'contribution' implies an aloofness as something supplied from some 'other' quarter. This is well seen in the fact that there is no tradition in Tamil referring to the Tamil Saivaite literature as contribution to Tamil. In fact, both in South India and Sri Lanka the dominant view is that Tamil is synonymous with Saivaism. This has gone even to the extent of keeping Vaisnavaism, which is so much a part of the Tamil tradition, apart. This view was so common in the early fifties that a Muslim, writing on his own religious literature called it 'Muslim contribution to Tamil Literature' (Uwise 1954).

A better scientific attitude would be to take these as the constituent units of what we call Tamil culture and analyse the role of each in contributing to the homogeneity and composition of Tamil culture. Such a view would benefit not only the literary history of Tamil but also its cultural history.

Yet another approach could be to study the process of the acculturation of Tamil (as a language) to the Indian and the non-Indian religions. A study of the process of the acculturation of the two non-Indian religions (Islam and Christianity) in the Tamilian context, that is how they were able to tap the linguistic and literary hertiage of this culture, so long dominated by other religions to coin terms to express their religious

needs without giving place to any ambiguity, would be a stimulating pursuit.[9]

It is important at this juncture to observe the literary significance of the political move by C.N.Anna-durai to highlight the pre-religious Tamil Literature as the focal point of Tamil culture. In terms of chronology and content it was the Cankam Literature that was made to play this role. For a political movement like the DMK with its policy of both secularism and democracy it was essential to tap the seculiaristic tradition in Tamil Literature; thus their emphasis on Cankam Literature and Kural. In the case of Kural it was its non-religious character that gets highlighted during the period of the fifties and sixties.[10]

Thus the task of literary history in delineating the role of the literatures of the sub-groups within the individual groups and in the cohesive role they play in bringing these sub-groups into a major politically active linguistic group would be as much a need to understand the politics of Tamilnadu as it is to assess its literary heritage.

V

A discussion on the role of the religious groups and the erroneous characterization of their writings as 'Contributions' thereby distancing them from the core or Tamilian culture leads to another problems of a necessarily controversial character.

Ernest Hatch Wilkins, in the introduction to his 'A History of Italian Literature' has this to say:

> "Any attempt to separate literature written in Italian from literature written in other languages by the same men or by their companion writers would be unjustifiably artificial. In this book, accordingly Italian literature is regarded as comprising all literary

composition by Italian writers from 13th century on, whether in Italian or other languages'.[11]

It has been a tradition among us to take the Tamil writings of non-Tamils especially the Christians, without going into a proper analysis of how much of the literary idiom of the author's mother tongue whether Beschi or Nobili--has been imported into Tamil Literature. But we have not when discussing the literary history of Tamil, taken into count the writings of Sankaracharya and Ramanuja, even though it has been accepted that in their writings in Sanskrit, they must have taken in a lot of literary idiom of Tamil.

Of course from a very limited view point, we are only worried about the writings in Tamil. This may be the answer from an author whose main task has been presenting a history of Tamil Literature. But whether this would be adequate to answer the question whether Tamil Literature alone is enough to know about the history of Tamilian thought is another point. Studies in South Indian Hindu Culture have shown that much of the ritualistic practices though preserved in Sanskrit do really belong to South Indian Culture. The problem is heightened because of the fact that Sanskrit had been the cultural lingua franca of India and anybody who wished to be brought within the Great Tradition of Indian thought wanted his writing to be in Sanskrit.

It is, therefore, of great importance that to think in terms of a complete and comprehensive literary history of the Tamils, a thorough study of the Sanskrit works written by Tamils should also be undertaken. It is a fact of the history of Sanskrit Literature that after the establishment of the Muslim rule in North India, literature in Sanskrit comes mainly from the south. P.S.Subramaniya Sastri's *History of Sanskrit Literature* written in Tamil gives the name of those poets from

south, mainly Thanjavur and Madurai who have written in Sanskrit.[12] It is told that the language, the idiom, and the style of those Sanskrit works from the south differ from those written in the north.[13]. A comprehensive work like that of Kunjunni Raja is needed for Tamil[14] Such a study is very essential to the understanding of Vaisnavaism and is no less important for Saivaism.

The all Indian significance of some of the basically Tamilian writings would be highlighted only by a study of this type. This is not to say that works of that type are not available. There are. For instance any study of Ramanuja in any language would have highlighted the poetic outpourings of Andal and Nammalvar. But in most of the histories of Tamil Literature, especially those written in Tamil, it may not be possible to find discussion on how the hymns of the Alvars became the basis of a school of thought in Indian philosophy. Even when they deal with the Saiva Siddhanta philosophy, there is more effort to explain it within the range of Tamil texts than to establish its uniqueness in terms of other Indian schools of thought.

Another language, the study of which is important to establish the Tamilian thought of the post-Cola pre-British period is Telugu. It will be interesting to know to what extent the musical compositions of Thyagaraja Swamikal depict, the Bhakthi traditions found in Tamil Literature, to what extent Kamban's Ramayana had an impact on him in formulating his vision of Rama. It is inconceivable that a person living in an area completely surrounded by Tamil culture was not able to imbibe some thing of its literary heritage.[15]

Telugu has literary forms like Koravanchi, which have been taken from Tamil. Maratti too must have been a beneficiary of the contact it had with Tamil during the Maratta rule in Thanjavur. The same should be said of the interrelationship with Sinhala. After

all there had been Tamil books written in Sinhala court and Tamil language studied in Sri Lankan Buddhist privenas.[16]

It is therefore important that a proper literary history of Tamil should include a study of such works in languages like Sanskrit, Telugu, Malayalam, Sinhala to establish the nature and the extent of the development of Tamilian thought. It is by a work of that type that it would be possible to establish the Indianness of Tamil. It is as much essential to emphasize the Indianness of this literary tradition as it is now being done to emphasize its internationalist character (in terms of the new literary developments like putukkavitai, the new poetry).

VI

It is as much a need to clearly identify the basic roots of the literary culture as it is to clarify its inter connections at an all India level. Perhaps the most welcome tendency in Tamil research in the past three decades is the committed interest in folk studies. Folk literary forms have been studied intensively and extensively. The researches in linguistics, in dialectal surveys and in socio-linguistic studies have helped to widen this perspective further. But the cumulative impact of these researches on the study of Tamil culture is yet to be seen.

There is also a larger question involved. In the context of Tamil studies, what exactly is the definition of the term 'folk'? In view of the reality of the dichotomy of the cultural existence--the non-Sanskritised culture and the Sanskritised culture--the definition of the term 'folk' and the assessment of the culture in terms of the pre-Sanskritic culture and the non-Sanskritic culture of the Tamils is very important. The concept of 'folk' as understood in the industrialised countries, where folk studies developed originally

cannot be held as valid in the context of Tamil Studies. The concept of Sanskritization must not be abused. It refers to certain forms of socio cultural behaviour in the *process of social change:* In fact the very terminology accepts the reality; there is a non-Sanskritic level of living and a Sanskritic level of living. The concept of *desi* and *marga* seem to be more relevant in this context. Even the concept of Great Tradition and Little Tradition, as explained by Milton Singer and others, will not be of much use, because in that scheme of things the Great Tradition is distinguishable by the scriptural sanction it has. In the case of Tamil society, the agamic rituals have got to be distinguished from the vedic rituals.

In such a situation, the definition of 'folk' become very crucial. In the case of Tamil drama, we know that what is now considered the folk drama is really not folk drama in the European sense of the term, but is the genuine Tamilian theatre. In a multi structural society with a history of uneven development like the Tamil society the definition of the term 'folk' has to be done with great care.

VII

A literary history of a community written only in terms of the literature of that community alone, will not be able to provide a true picture of the function and role of literature in that society. Literature as a social practice in a society has to be studied in relation to the practice and function of the other arts.

It is seldom realized that the conventional similies we have in Tamil tradition especially in the literature of post-600 A.D. are very sculpturesque. In fact, Cankam Literature with all its insistence on love does not provide many erotic descriptions of any young girl. This was possible only along with and after the development of sculpture. It will not be impossible to chalk out

the aesthetics of Tamil poetry without reference to the architectural and sculptural developments of Tamilnad. After all, the aesthetics of an age or a community cannot differ from art to art. The basic aesthetic sense would be the same with manifestations appropriate to the individual art forms.

The significance of the interrelationship of other art forms to literature, especially to literary creativity could be realised in the currency of such critical terms like 'baroque', 'gothic' and 'impressionistic'. These are terms taken from architecture and painting to describe similar concepts.

It is therefore important that literary history of Tamil should pay attention to the development of the art of literature in relation to the development of other arts -- folk arts included.

One area which has suffered because of the lack of such an approach in our histories of literature is the study of the development of prosody. For one thing we do not have any outstanding modern works on prosody except perhaps the one by A.C. Chettair.[17] Prosody is studied in terms of letters and feet, not in terms of music. Prosody is ultimately connected with the 'tempo' of social development, for the basic sound patterns available in a society cannot be unrelated to the dynamics of that society. That is why every social change is marked also by a change in the sound pattern, the metre, the prosody. The shift of the popular writings from *Akaval* to *Viruttam* in Tamil was not merely an exercise in prosody, it was also transition from a particular form of social existence to another from a particular form of social relations to another. The breakdown of the traditonal metre in verse today is not unconnected with the breakdown in the traditional modes of the society and a change in the pace of life, to which we are not yet accustomed; we are

not yet in tune with it, that is why so many jumps in the metres also the pace itself has not established its own rhythm. This an age of transition, metrically, as is socially, economically and politically Literature is ceasing to be an oral art among the articulate groups; print is the medium. And *Putukkavitai* (new poetry) is meant for the print i.e. for the eye. The initial perception is by the optical system and then is converted to the auditory imagination. Thus, the importance of the varying length of lines in modern poetry.

VIII

This takes us on to the question of literary history and literary production. There has so far been no attempt to study the mode of literary production from the time writing emerged as the dominant means of communication in Tamil. The organization essential for the physical production and reproduction of a literary work (writing on Cola manuscripts, taking down what teacher says etc.), the role of the literary artist in relation to those who assisted him in this production, how the produced work was transmitted, from one place to another and from one generation to the other, the centres of reproduction and distribution are matters of vital scholarly research in literary history. But so far no work has been done in these fields.

As a comparison, it is interesting to look at some volumes of the Cambridge History of English Literature:

Vol.IV- Prose and Poetry North to Drayton
Chapter XVIII--The Book Trade 1557-1625.
Chapter XIX--The Foundation of Libraries

Vol.XI-The period of the French Revolution
Chapter XIV - Book Production and Distribution 1625-1800.

Because of the lack of studies of this type we have not yet been able to determine the extent and influence of the literary articulate group, or even trace sources of inspiration for the works. Without studies of this type we would not be able to gauge the extent of the social practice of literature.

What is tragic is that an approach to reading and book distribution is completely lacking even in studies of Modern literature.[18] We yet know little of the structure of propensity of the book trade. For a population of 6 crores of Tamil people in India with a literacy rate of 40% i.e., with 2½ crores of reading public, the print order of an average novel is only thousand copies. Even the three and a half lakh circulation of *Kumudam* cannot be considered very high in terms of the literacy rate.

One need not labour the point that moden literary history is not possible without adequate studies on book development. Tamil literary history lacks it.

IX

As an extension of the question of literacy, readership and book trade it is important to take up the question of the emergence of mass-culture and the formation of mass-literature as a constituent unit of that mass-culture.[19] Magazines and paperbacks have contributed to this mass-literature explosion. In the Western countries it has led to the popularization of certain forms of fiction-writing, and these are not considered part of serious literary writing. They are of course important material for literary study, but they are not serious literature[20] and are treated as such. But in Tamilnadu, we yet have not realised the significance of the growth of reading material for mass readership and do not distinguish it from serious literature. These seriously effect the pursuit of literary criticism. It is hightime that studies of modern literature go into the problem

of the emerging mass culture and its literary concomitants as a serious part of the literary development in Tamil. In fact we have yet to bring out a history of modern popular reading in Tamilnadu.

While there has to be a proper effort to distinguish art as a commodity produced with all care for a popular (mass) reading, efforts should also be made to study the folk literary forms and establish their identity and changing forms and function.

All this argue in favour of the development of communication studies as a source to understand the literary developments. Studies of Literary Communication need not be time bound; they can relate to ancient as well as modern periods.

X

A major task awaiting the literary historian of Tamil is to organise an academic structure to study the development of Tamil Literature in the different countries, as depicting national problems and at the same time as belonging to the language-culture group, thus evolving a 'common' pattern. That is, Sri Lankan and Malaysian Tamil Literature should be studied as both Sri Lankan and Malaysian National Literatures and at the same time Tamil Literature. Tamil Literature in South India is Indian Literature as much it is Tamil Literature. The efforts taken so far to evolve an integrated look have not been successful. It is important that this problem is faced fairly and squarely.

XI

The major problematic of Tamil literary history is of course the dating of its ancient and medieval texts. The manner the previous paper had been charted out revealed that it is not merely a question of literature; it is a question of politics and the question is

not going to be solved at the literary level without a change in social attitude.

These are some of the problematics i.e., not the problems themselves, but those which tend to constitute the problem in the development of literary development.

It is the responsibility of the literary historian to realize the integral role of literature in social life and to look for it in history and the manner he does it should underline the role of literature in social change and in formulating thoughts which demonstrate the need for such social change.

IV

VIEWING TAMIL LITERARY DEVELOPMENT--PROBLEMS OF PERIODISATION

I

The preceding chapter attempted to deal with what should constitute a history of Tamil Literature and/or a literary history of Tamil. The basic premise was that only then it would be possible to get a 'comprehensive' history of the Tamils.

The important question at this stage is what should history have to be comprehensive, and why should it have them. It is at this point, trying to answer this question, that we realise that we want, or rather need, history *for* something. If what is given as 'history' is not enough to give us what we want, we attempt to find those extra things, and thus history 'expands'. This makes history a tool, not something which is an end in itself. The positivist effort in historical method 'to determine the veracity of the record, to eliminate distortion and to read back through the record to the real conditions of which it is a representation'[1] is only to ensure that we get the correct answers for the questions we have. Beyond that method has no value. The

questions are determined by our contemporary need and consciousness. The histories written at different times reveal what the historians had wanted to know. This shows that history constitutes the knowledge of the past according to the needs and the norms of the present. That is, every history has tried to answer the questions of the present or arising in the present about the past.

This becomes quite evident when we go through the different periodisations of Tamil Literature done by the various scholars (Appendix VII). Living today at a better vantage point of research and knowledge, it is easy for us to criticise them, to point out the flaws, to point out their inadequacies, and to expose their inconsistencies. It would be a more useful exercise to combine the search for the 'how' (they saw the development) with the more relevant question of 'what' they wanted to see.

II

At the start the attempt was to identify the extent of the literature than to investigate into the sources of its inspiration and the forces that necessitated those creations. Later attempts were better equipped with the material data, of the texts themselves, of the authors, their dates and of the background in which they operated, began to identify the literary development in terms of the literary forms, the sources of patronage, the socio-cultural functions performed by literature etc.

A close analysis of the various periodisations would reveal the expanding horizons of the historiography of literary development. The periodisations given by Caldwell, Purnalingam Pillai, Marimalai Atikal and Chelvanayakam indicate the expanding horizons of literary history. Whereas Caldwell tries to establish the very extent of Tamil Literature as is known to him as 'Cycles', a term quite popular in Western literary studies, espe-

cially in relation to poems 'collected round a central event or idea', Purnalingam Pillai in 1904, with a personal involvement in the Tamil Renaissance movement and a sound academic background in English Literature, sees the development in terms of 'ages' (echoes, perhaps, of Elizabethan age etc.,) Maraimalai Atikal's (1930) periodisation is the first one based on the socio-political ideology of the author. He begins with the *Tanittamil kalam* (the age of literatures written in Tamil only) and sees the subsequent literary periods as dominated by various alien forces. The fifth and the sixth, the Parppana Kalam and the Ankilakalam clearly reveal this. It should be mentioned that, the work *Manickavasagar Kalamum Varalarum* in which he gives this periodisation is stimulating polemics. It is a pity that this work has not received the attention it deserves. Chelvanayakam's periodisation is important for it is the first one which attempts, not wholly though, to present the literary development against the background of the political history of Tamilnadu. This periodisation has now become popular, because some of the more popular text books have taken over this periodisation, regretfully without any acknowledgement. The scheme that operates now at degree class level -- Cankam, post-Cankam, Pallava, Cola, Vijayanagara Emperor, Modern Periods--was first given by Chelvanayakam.

Vaiyapuri Pillai's periodisation reveals him well; it is more a categorisation of the literary activities than an effort to trace the evolution of a literary heritage itself and, as we know, as a scholar, this was his main achievement.

III

When it is accepted that it is the intellectual demands of the time that determines the pattern of periodisation any attempt to review the question of periodising Tamil Literature should at the outset, clearly state the perspectives that it seeks.

The following quotation provides the key to the concept of literary history as explained and discussed in this work.

> "Literary formation is integral to social formation. In otherwords, there cannot be a society organized, in the real sense of the term, without a literature for itself".

The main purpose, therefore, is to see how literature has been an indispensable and integral factor in the various social formations among the Tamils. Having viewed the role literature plays in social relations and arrived at a theoretical position that, in terms of the perspective of the totality of social life, literature is both the product of its age, and also its producer, it now remains to work out how this was operating in the case of Tamil Literature.

To do this, we should investigate how in the past it was possible to integrate social aspirations with literary production and how in fact literature was 'used' for social purposes. For, have we not in our tradition, the commendable ideal that the aim of the book or the written word, should enable us to attain *aram*, *porul*, *inpam* and *veedu* (right morals, right subsistence, right happiness and liberation)? The answer to the questions what today constitute the right morals and what is the best form of liberation would differ from person to person and ideology to ideology.

It is therefore sought to see how successful and unsuccessful Tamil Literature has been in its pursuit of these four *purusartas*, as they are normally referred to and more importantly, to see whose morals, subsistence, happiness and liberation have been taken as the society's ones.

This statement of the objectives demand an explanation of what is meant by social formation.

Before embarking on that, it should be stated that the periodisation introduced by Chelvanayakam is not quite adequate to bring out the answers to the questions raised above.

First and foremost the term *Cankam-Maruviya Kalam'*, translated as post-Cankam Literature (literally it would mean that period which comes along side the Cankam) does not mean anything as a period. It is a well known fact that what is known as post-Cankam literature is very much an anti-thesis of the dominant Cankam trend. It was only chronologically post-Cankam. The predominant literary feature of this period was its didacticism and even those works, which denote a continuity in the *akam* and *puram* themes are lifeless imitations of the early works. The term 'Pallava Period' is rather misleading because as the political history of the period reveals, Pallavas did not rule the entire Tamilnadu; Pandyas were ruling the Far-South. Nilakanta Sastri refers to it as Pandya-Pallava rule.[2] It is also true that the Pandya rule and the Pandya territory are very important in the history of the Bhakthi movement. Tirugnana Sambandar's activities were confined to the Pandya Nadu. It is true that the Pallavas were dominant and the pattern of administration, political, social and economic sets the frame work for the next five centuries. But it is equally important that the rule of the Pandyas in the cultural and the political life of Tamilnadu should not be underestimated. Chelvanayakam's *Colapperumannar Kalam* adequately deals with the activities of the later Colas, but the ensuing period is not clearly defined. The distinction between the direct Vijayanagar rule and the rule of the Nayakka Chieftains has not been made clear. Besides, this period does not bring into clear focus the socio-cultural extensions and the proliferating political fragmentations of the period. The historical chronology of the period reveals that the beginnings of the 'European period' has to be seen in the days of the Nayakka and the Maharatta Chiefs themselves.

The terms used do not help us to get the answers for the questions raised above. The necessity to explore the meaning of the concept of social formation is now all the more essential.

IV

The concept of 'social formation' is explained as follows:

> "It (social formation) designates a complex structure of social relations, a unity of economic, ideological and in certain cases, political structural levels in which the role of the economy is dominant. It is determinant in the sense that the conditions of existence of the dominant relations of production assign to each of the levels a certain form of effectivity and mode of intervention with respect to the other levels".[3]

The advantage of this concept lies in that it does not highlight any one aspect--dynasties, literary genres, political systems as the characteristic feature to identify the 'soul' of the period. Instead of going for any one of those aspects, this concept brings to focus the entire 'structuration' of the society into the picture. As has been pointed out effectively 'the history of human society is an integral whole, and socio-economic formations are first of all stages in the development of this integral whole".[4]

This concept known as 'social formation', also referred to as 'socio-economic formation', and 'social and economic formation', is useful in the analysis of concrete historical societies. Maurice Godelier describes step by step, what we should do to establish the social and economic formation of a society at a given time of its historical existence.

> "In determining a social and economic formation we shall be able to produce a *synthetic definition* of the exact nature of the particular diversity

and unity of economic and social relations which characterise a society during a specific epoch.

In order to obtain this synthetic definition, a Marxist perspective requires a number of scientific steps, for example:

(1) identify the number and nature of the different modes of production[5] combined in a specific society and which constitute the economic basis of that particular epoch.

(2) identify the different elements in the social and the ideological superstructure which in origin and function corresponds to the different modes of production.

(3) determine the exact form and content of the articulation, that is the continuation of different modes found in a hierarchical relationship (one in relation to another) when one of the modes of production dominates the others, obliges them in some way to adapt to the needs and logic of its own functioning system and integrates them more or less into the mechanism of its own production.

(4) determine the proper functions of all elements in both the infracture and the ideology which in spite of the different origins due to different modes of production, are combined in a specific manner according to the way the different modes of production are *assimilated* are whatever their origins these features of the superstructure are, to some degree, redefined and recharged".[6]

Godelier needs close attentive reading especially in the context of Tamil Studies to which the application of this concept is new. In the analysis of the social formation the fourth point is the most crucial to this exercise. Committed as we are to understand, *the role of literature, in society, in time*, it is important for

us to have a clear notion of ideology, which is the 'theoretically elaborated system of views and social values'. Ideology is the system of political, legal, scientific, philosophical, religious, ethical and aesthetic ideas and is directly related to the class character of the person or the institution with whom or which it is associated. The significance of literature lies in its dual role of depicting the ideology of the dominant forces and helping to mould that ideology clearly and unambiguously for the 'consumption' of the public at large so that they are ideologically conditioned to accept or *reject* the norms of that society. Literature helps to mould an ideological position out of the prevailing social consciousness. This had been done in Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin, in Gorky's Mother and in Appar's *Tevaram 'Naam aarkum Kudi allom* .

The attempt to identify the ideology or ideologies expressed in the literary works and understanding it or them in the background of the social consciousness of the period should be done, as emphasized earlier, within the totality of social relations.

To do this in the Tamilian context we need a history of Tamilnadu on these lines. Any student of the history of Tamilnadu would in all sincerity confess that we have hardly the evidences for this type of history. On the other hand, on the basis of the work that has been already done by Nilakanta Sastri and K.K.Pillai and on the strength of the work that is being done in the different disciplines like epigraphy (the significant work that is being done by Noboru Karashima, Y.Subbarayalu and others), archaeology (by R.Nagasamy, K.V. Raman and others), linguistic studies (V.I.Subramoniam, S.V.Shanmugam and others), anthropology (Kathleen Gough and others), history (Burton Stein and others) and above in literary studies itself, it seems possible to bring together the knowledge that has been gained in these various fields to get a picture of the social totality of the various historical phases of Tamilnadu.

It is of utmost importance that this be done in the background of Indian and South Asian Studies; otherwise the perspectives will not at all be clear.

It is only when we bring together the contributions to historical knowledge of this various scholars that we will be able to get a picture of the modes of production, and of the different elements in the social and ideological superstructure. That again is a combined effort on the part of the political, economic and social historians. The literary historian has a place in this team, but this is only a supplementary (and sometimes elucidating) role. It is in the background of such a necessity that an effort, very preliminary and tentative, is being made to suggest a periodisation that would be inclusive enough to understand the developments in Tamilnadu, political, economic, social, literary and ideological. It is proposed to do it on the basis of the concept of social formation.

Having seen, obviously only in very outline form, the concept of social formation, let us now see what is periodisation and what it involves in chalking out periods in history on the basis of the concept of social formation.

Senake Bandaranaike has explained it quite well:

> "a periodisation . . . . is much more than merely a division of time into historical phases, whose various characteristics are then descriptively enumerated. It involves a theoretical formation, a concept of historical motion. It is an attempt at a systematic and comprehensive demarcation of successive stages of historical development. These stages or phases are marked by distinctive social, economic, political and cultural *interrelations* and by major and minor *transformations*. These

> transformations while being part of continual process of change are also moments (or periods) of historical crisis, where profound structural changes are brought about in the character and organization of society. To us looking at them from a historical distance they appear as *historical watersheds* or *historical leaps* from one distinctive way of life and another. Thus the society which existed before such a transformation and that which comes into being as a result is not merely quantitatively but qualitatively different".[7]

A very graphic description indeed of the transition from one social formation to another.

It is our task now to look for those 'historical watersheds' in the history of Tamilnadu.

V

An attempt at periodisation of the history of Tamilnadu based on the concept of social formation demands a full knowledge of *all* the aspects of Tamilian life as political, economic, social and cultural history would jointly and severally reveal. It also calls for a multi-disciplinary approach, calling into service such disciplines as anthropology, sociology, linguistics etc.

Taken at an overall plane Tamilnadu seems to have more than enough sources, for today there is, hardly any period which could be called a dark age.[8] N. Subramaniam has this to say:

> "Judged by the normality about the sources of Indian history it may be said that history of Tamilnad is most amply authenticated by source-material. But it may also be remembered that sumptuousness is not necessarily the same as being satisfactory. Hence, *while we have an abundance of material which can be called 'source' in one sense or another*

still one has numerous areas of that history for which one wishes there was more straightforward and factual information based on chronology" [9]

Besides, there arise many problems relating to the sources when we shift the focus from mere narration of events to more composite history. Y.Subbarayalu refers to some of it in relation to the study and the use of inscriptions [10] Some of the senior historians do not seem to appreciate the need for new orientations in historical study.[11]

Nevertheless the progress in the direction is more than encouraging. The work done by Noboru Karashima, Subbarayalu and Shanmugam for the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia & Africa, Japan, the work Burton Stein has been doing, for sometime and the anthropological writing of Kathleen Gough, Brenda Beck and the sociological writings of Andre Beteille and others could now be taken together to get a picture of Tamilnadu much wider than what we have in histories we have. This is not to minimise the importance of these dynastic histories, for they are the columns on which these later structures stand.

For the purposes of this study, I have to avoid extensive argumentation, tried to synthesize the research findings of some of these scholars to present this periodisation in brief outline.[12]

A periodisation based on the concept of socio-economic formation demands that we identify, as Godelier has shown earlier, the articulate mode of production, a specific unity of productive forms and corresponding relations of production. We take into count "the structural element of socio-economic formation the politico-juridical and ideological superstructure" [13] In such a view of history we cannot evidently think of Government, Social on Economic conditions, Religion etc. as mutually exclusive compartments.

In the present situation of the knowledge of the history of Tamilnadu the 'unit of time' which could be taken as one, in terms of the above needs is the period between circa 600 A.D and 1400 A.D. Even the earlier historians have seen the underlying unity within this time span. Nilakanta Sastri who in terms of dynastic history would call this era, the Pandya-Pallava period, the Chola period and the second Pandyan empire. While writing on the social and economic conditions of the Pallava period he observed that, "the framework of society and economy continued more or less the same under the Cholas but the establishment of a large kingdom embracing the whole of Tamil country and sometimes stretching beyond, brought its own repercussions".[14] Having thus seen the continuity of a particular socio-economic system from Pallava to Chola times, he, in his remarks on the administrative character of the second Pandyan Kingdom says that "under the second empire of the Pandyas which replaced the Chola power in the thirteenth century over the whole Tamil country, the governmental set-up and institutions of the Chola empire continued more or less intact and large scale innovations were few".[15] Burton Stein, noting his reservation about the tendency among the historians of South India to emphasize the disjunctive character of Pallava society and culture (from the previous period) asserts that "a major feature Pallava society and that of the successful Chola age was that it was organized into a large number of localities of peasant society and culture".[16] The basic commonness of underlying features is thus seems it is interesting to note that other historians too have tended to take these periods comprising the rules of the Pallavas and of the Cholas as forming one historical unit.[17] The naming of the units may vary but they have been taken as an "epoch" or "phase".

The period would range from the establishment of a new Pallava rule to the order by the establishment of a new socio-economic order by the Nayaks.

The next unit would be the assumption of political and administrative control of the region by the Britishers. "It is difficult to assign specific dates for gradual changes but the new order may be said to begin with the transfer by the treaty of Mangalore (1972) to British rule of Dindigul and surrounding territory and of Baramahal. From this date administration became the chief duty of the Company's servants"[18] By 1800, the British had acquired most of what was to become their "presidency of Madras"[19] and with that we enter the modern period of Tamilnadu, in which the inter-relation of national and regional aspirations decide the pattern of development. The introduction of the British rule saw the coming in of new socio-political features like the rule of law, which the hierarchically patterned Tamil society never had earlier.

No effort is made in this paper to study the modern period.

Thus at this stage, of our discussion relating to the pre-19th century Tamilnadu, we have two well-defined epochs each worth of being called a socio-economic formation and a third for which we have not yet made any reference.

The two well-defined epochs are:

(a) circa 600 - 1371/1400 and
(b) circa 1400 - 1800

The pre-600 A.D. is the one which has not yet been looked into. The pre-600 period, also referred to as the pre-Pallavan period, is now sometimes referred to as the Classical Period. Burton Stein and Nambi Arooran refer to it so.[20]

First let us take the rather well-defined periods (7th - 14th century and 15th to 19th century) and try to piece together the information we have on the social

formations and see how literature was integrated to each of the formations.

Before we start analysing the exact character of the socio-economic formations, it is important that we remind ourselves of one important factor. In literary history, particularly at the text book level, the characteristic feature of a particular age is taken as a stasis, something unchanging from the beginning to the end. It is seldom realised that the period, or the socio-economic formation in this case, has also an evolutionary scale of development. It has a genesis, a process of growth, a full bloom and a decline or sudden interruption by another system, which ultimately leads to a supercession by another formation. Thus the social formation could be seen in historical perspective. Even though it is true that in a social formation a particular ideology will be dominant, there could be variations in the manner the ideology expresses itself in the different phases within the period of that formation. An illuminating example could be the use of the Bhakti hymns in the seventh and eighth centuries and in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At the initial stage they were expressions of popular awakening and of protest whereas at the final stage they became essential organs to "service" the temple system that controlled and co-ordinated local life. It is, therefore, important that both the historical and the dialectical aspects of growth are noticed at every stage and that easy schematizations are avoided. Having noted this important methodological reservation, let us now try to see the exact character of the socio-economic formations of these periods.

It has been held almost as a verified truth (with no serious inquiry into the characteristics of exact nature of the production relations) that the Cola and Vijayanagara Phases were basically feudal.[21] But there is now a differing view. Analysing the mode of production that existed in the Cola empire from about 850A.D., Kathleen Gough says:

"In spite of the existence of a kind of serfdom among some of the peasant and artisans, I do not think that we can speak of feudalism. For the relations of dependence were communal rather than personal or interfamilial, there was very little private possession and management of estates, the estates of the aristocrats and the temples were still audited by and under the control of the state and peasant communes still governed a large proportion of the villages without resident aristocrats. Neither in theory nor in practice was there any suggestion of no land without a lord"[22]

Arguing that the Cola system does not reveal any of the characteristics of feudalism found in Kerala and in the Moghul period, she adduces eleven reasons as to why she considers the mode as approximating to the Asiatic mode of production suggested by Marx[23] In the earlier Paper (Feb 1980) she has argued this case in some detail and said "Cola society (c. 850 - 1260) corresponded to Marx's model of the Asiatic mode of production and to Ribeiro's Theocratic Irrigation State"[24]

At this stage it is perhaps relevant to know what is this Asiatic mode of production which Marx has spoken of. Defining the system, Marx had this to say:

"the individual does not become independent of the community; that the circle of production is self-sustaining, unity of agriculture and craft manufacture etc. If the individual changes his relation to the community, he modifies and undermines both the community and its economic premise; conversely the modification of this economic premise, produced by its own dialectic pauperisation etc"[25]

Kathleen Gough does not say that the Cola system was that simple. She says it approximate to this model than to the feudal model.

Guna has challenged Kathleen Gough's suggestion and has argued that "the attributes of the said Asiatic mode to the Tamil society is totally untenable". He reiterates that it was feudalism which was in vogue in Tamilnadu and goes on to say that "if a detailed study is undertaken it may reveal that there was no such qualitative difference between the feudalism in the Tamil country and Kerala, as made out by Kathleen Gough; and the evidences of feudal element seen in *Padirruppattu* which tell the history of the ten Chera Kings of the Sangam period may substantiate it".[26] Guna's objection to Kathleen Gough, though significant, does not seem to have based itself on a comprehensive analysis of all the epigraphical literary and other data. There is a more important contribution in this problem.

Burton Stein known for his studies on South Indian History,[27] finding that he is unable to describe the power structure of the Tamil country during the period in terms that are familiar to Indian historiography has taken a "type" discussed in terms of an East African Society,

> "The Medieval South Indian state is here considered a segmentary state, in which political authority and control were local in several crucial ways. The scope of the constituent unite of the state was limited to well-defined and persistent ethnic territories; its chiefs were, in most cases, leaders or spokesmen of the dominant ethnic groups of the local territory; and perhaps most unique in south India, corporate bodies representing the interesting of various folks of a locality participated in the public business of the locality".[28]

He gives a picture of the segmentary state as follows:

"This is the pyramidally segmented type of states so called because the smallest unit of political organization -- for example, a section of a peasant village was linked to ever more comprehensive units of political organization of an ascending order (e.g. villages, locality, supra-locality and kingdom) for various purposes but that each unit stood in opposition to other, smaller units (e.g. one section of a village as against another) for other purposes".[29]

He gives the following characteristics of a segmentary state:

(1) Sovereignty is dual-actual political sovereignty or control and ritual sovereignty

(2) There are numerous centres of which one has primacy as a source of ritual sovereignty but all exercise actual political control over a part or segment

(3) The specialised administrative staff is not an exclusive feature of the primary centre, but found at and within all segments

(4) Subordinate levels or zones of the segmentary state may be distinguished and the organization of these is pyramidal[30]

This approximates very well to the structure of Cola administration -- The Cola *Mandalam*, at the centre of the segmentary state and then come the *nadus*.

As a model describing the structure especially in relation to the exercise of authority this gives a full view. That is, political sovereignty in certain places was real and at some places only ritual; at those places the segmentation, which is almost a reproduction

of the power structure (minus the ritual authority of the king) takes place.

Stein also provides the details relating to the economic management of this segments. *The crucial question is what was the production relations with in the state and between the state proper and the segment*[31] In the case of the Cola economic organization, the productive forces (the means of production of material goods and the people who use these means) were operating within the segments.

If the question of the production relation between the various segments is raised, it would not be possible to leave the Asiatic mode unexamined more critically. The closed nature of the caste organization, the continuity of the productive system within the segment would no doubt remind one of the Asiatic mode. In analysing the social formational significance of the *Tinai* concept, the present writer found that "the economic organization implied in the *Tinai* system reveals that it is the Asiatic mode operating at the very primary level".[32]

There are two questions which need simultaneous attention in considering the solution to this problem of characterising the socio-economic formation.

(a) The question of the uneven development of the regions and

(b) the social hierarchy and its relation to the production i.e. the manner of social exploitation.

It is equally true that an analysis of the feudal mode of production would reveal that the Cola system was not feudal in the sense it is normally understood. But the history of the intellectual discussion on Asiatic mode has to be noted here:

> "The omission of the "Asiatic mode" occurred, broadly speaking, between the late 1920's and the late 1930's since the characteristic for Marx was resistance to historical evolution its elimination produces a simpler scheme which lends itself more readily to universal and unilinear intrepretation.
>
> Since very early post-Marxist times there have been attempts to see a sort of primitive or proto-feudalism as the first general thought not necessarily universally occurring, form of class society growing out of the disintegration of primitive communism".[33]

So the whole question has to be argued in greater detail.

An analysis of the Asiatic Mode of Production cannot be done at the level of its applicability alone. There are much more fundamental issues involved. One has to consider first of all, the question of the very acceptability in Marxist terms. Unlike in the case of the other modes of production (slavery, feudal etc.) the term• Asiatic mode is descriptive, and refers to a particular process as it existed in a particular region. Besides there is also the question of the validity of the concept of a lack of internal conflict which ensures the continuity of that system over a very long period of time. The political implications of accepting the long duration of Oriental despotism are too many.[34]

It is, therefore, incumbent on the part of South Indian historians to go into this question in greater detail. The character of uneven development upto the time of the emergence of the centralised, irrigation based state systems, the use of the undeveloped regions, the communities living there for the newly developing agriculture, and by the use of the caste system (with its

notion of pollution) to continue those groups within the social order (especially in the manner they were remunerated for their labour) should be studied in greater detail before any conclusive effort is made to characterise the mode of production.

The main problem that we have in determining the exact nature of the socio-economic formations of the period in relation to the character of the aristocracy that constituted the state-class (whether it could hold fiefs or not), is its role at the centre and the local levels. The role of religion and the religious institutions have not yet been studied.

At the present state of our knowledge of this problem, we have a valuable clue to a better understanding of this problem in the findings by Noboru Karashima of the emergence of the private land owning.

> "........ towards the close of the Cola rule private land owning became prevalent and these took place many land transfers between individuals and temples. As a consequence, some people accumulated large amount of land and given as locally influential big landlords. Counter balancing this, some people lost possession of their *Kani* lands and must have slipped down to the position of tenants or landless cultivators. This indicates the emergence of a new agrarian order in the Lower Kaveri Valley in the 13th century. Though we are still unable to say whether this means the appearance of a feudal system or not, this new agrarian order seems to brought changes in the relations of many communities belonging to the locality".[35]

It is interesting to note that in another paper (yet unpublished) *Valangai/Idangai Kaniyalar and Irajakkarattar:* Social conflicts in Tamilnadu in the 15th century", Karashima and Subbarayalu speak in the following terms:

Broadly speaking, we may be able to consider the three centuries after the decline of Cola central power, i.e. from the 13th to 15th centuries, as the transitional period in which some new social formation generated accompanying the socio-economic changes in those regions and being accompanied by many conflicts and confrontations between the different social sections. The establishment of the Nayaka's rule in Tamilnadu in the 16th century seems to have meant the consolidation of a new social formation in the region and the termination of the transitional period.

What is of interest to us inquiring into how literature helped this formation and how literature was used to legitimise this formation is to see the pattern of the literary development and the ideological conditioning it received and provided.

Without going into the details we have to see two lines of development. One starting from the singing the praise of the kings daily and ending up with the hero-worshipping of the personality of the King (seen the *meikirtis* on one hand and in the ulas and paranis on the other), the other one dealing with the Bhakthi movement. The movement becomes so important to the Pallavas (among whom was one King who himself used the theatre to ridicule the Jains and the Buddhist ideologies) that royal patronages was extended to it. During the Cola period, there was more patronage given to this movement. Efforts were taken to salvage the lost poems; a minister himself takes upon the task of writing the life history of those involved in the movement.

Burton Stein sees the political role of these literary trends. Reviewing the different reasons adduced by the various historians for the new religious movement which brought the Brahmin and the rich cultivator together, he states that "the Brahmin-peasant alliance

of the Pallava period was based on the convergence of important interest which came to exist between those who cultivated the land along with their dependents and those who by their sacral functions possessed a powerful ideological capability. The benefits were mutual and alliance durable.[36] It is important to remember that it was this alliance of the religious and the cultivating groups "which constituted the underpinning of localized self-governing territories in South India from eight to the fourteenth centuries".[37]

As for the role of the literary effort that sought to consolidate the gains of the Bhakthi movement by codifying them, singing them at temples etc., at the height of the Cola rule, Stein has this to say:

> "During the Pallava age, Brahmins and peasants established close interdependancies based upon mutual benefit; the Cola saw this alliance flower to the full extent of the possibilities .... with Brahmins these dominant peasant groups maintained a tradition of Tamil learning which is solidly evidenced in great writers of the age who were *Vellalas* such as Sekkilar, author of *Periyapuranam;* with Brahmans also as the Saiva Siddhantha movement of the 13th century made clear some among these locality peasant groups cultivated the highest competence in Sanskrit knowledge".[38]

This literary formation is significant in terms of the place of Tamil in Indian history, Romila Thapar's two statements have great significance:

(a) "The Pallava period, therefore, also saw the emergence of what might be broadly described as the Tamil personality which was to contribute substantially to the development of Indian Civilization".[39]

(b) "the ascendancy of the south was due not solely to the power of the Colas but also to the fact that this period saw the crystallization of Tamil culture".[40]

The extent of the period from seventh to fourteenth should be now clear; also the significance of literature in the very crystalization of what we call Tamil culture within the Indian context.

It should be mentioned in passing that in the modern period there was a sharp reaction against this concept of Tamil culture and the regional movements, the Pure Tamil movement, the Dravida Kazhagam, and especially the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, avoided an all-India perspective (except when glorifying Tamil) and encouraged a more inward looking cultural attitude.

The next phase 1400 - 1800 is referred to as Vijayanagara phase; the socio-economic character of this phase is not much in doubt. Kathleen Gough has this to say:

"The Vijayanagar and the Maratha Government perhaps influenced by North Indian Muslim empires against which they were reacting, introduced some political and military relations of what had been called a tributory feudal period".[41]

A. Krishnaswamy has no hesitation in characterising this period as feudal. Burton Stein who likes to maintain that there is continuity of his segmentary pattern which seems to be highly doubtful now in the light of the statement quoted from Karashima & Subbarayalu however tries to understand the significance of the changes. The major factor is the change in the land system. He does not fail to see the significance of "the intrusion of Telugu warriors who, in time came to comprise part of new intermediary leadership. With this new leadership came new groups of cultivators, labourers

and mercantile groups".[42] The changed system of production relation with the addition of this new demographic element and above all, the political role of the Brahmins as fortress commanders or in other military and or administrative posts changed the entire ideological structure.

The need to appeal to religion to legitimise and to popularise the new type of political authority was great and thus the norms of Hinduism were established with a great fervour for Sanskrit. It is in this background that one has to assess the emergence and importance of the non-Brahmin saiva mutts in this phase.

The arrival of two non-Indian religions - Islam and Christianity, brought in great ideological changes in the very concept of Tamil literature.

A study of the social consciousness of this period will reveal the conflicting ideologies at work and it is that which makes this period rich and varied.

The one phase that has not been discussed so far is the pre-600 A.D. This would cover the traditional Cankam and the post-Cankam periods. It could now be claimed that the history of the pre-600 era is clearer than what it had been taken to be

Viewed in the background of the developments of the 600-1400 epoch this stands out in bold contrast in social, economic and political organization from the succeeding era.

An analysis of the pre-600 era would involve an examination of the following problems:

1) The socio-economic significance of the *Tinai* concept, the significance of the mode of production of each *Tinai* and the social relations found in it.

2) Class formation in Tamilnadu; development of agriculture and the role of irrigation in it.

- the history of the mercantile groups
- the emergence of an aristocracy

3) State formation in Tamilnadu - This would imply the study of the development of *Marutam* regions, the difference between the *Ventar* and the *Kurunila Mannar* -- the transformation of authority from personal leadership of groups (tribes) to land based rule.

4) Increasing acculturation with Sanskrit norms for legitimising political authority and social hierarchy.

Various studies have established the role of literature in the social formation of the Cankam period.[43] The pre-600 era has been phased out into three units of time.

The breakdown that has been given to the pre-600 A.D. is:

i) c. A.D. 100 to 250 Cankam age

ii) c. 250 A.D. to 450 A.D. Decline of Monarchies

iii) c. 436 A.D. to 560/590 - The Kalabhra Interrugnum

The attempt to name these as the heroic, the feudal and the mercantilist phase does not seem to indicate very correctly the socio-economic character of the phases. A deeper analysis should remedy the situation.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the four major periods in Tamil literary development would be:

1) From the beginnings to 600 A.D.

2) From circa 600 A.D. to circa 1400 A.D.

3) From circa 1400 A.D. to circa 1800 A.D.

4) From circa 1800 A.D. to the present

It should however be added that a closer study of the first period is urgently needed to determine its phases first and to see whether they need be considered as separate periods.

EPILOGUE

The two-day seminar, inaugurated by the Vice-Chancellor, with a note on the trends in analysing past literature from the point of view of the society and the individual, had four sittings, one for each of the four papers. A synopsis of the respective paper was given in Tamil. The fifteen participants who had been given the papers before hand were expected to discuss the paper after the introduction of the paper by the author. The observers, could join the discussion thereafter. Each of the session was concluded with a reply by the author.

The main question raised by the senior scholars, whose attachment to tradition is well known, was the suitability of the approach indicated by the author.

The discussion, understandably uneven in range and depth especially because of the emotional stances taken on the ideological base, ranged from such comments as "Marxism may be alright for society and politics but not for literature" to a plea to understand the dialectical manner literary tradition had evolved in Tamil. It could safely be said that, inspite of the heat that was generated in the discussion there was consensus that the Tamil literary tradition should be studied from different points of view to understand it fully.

It was inevitable that questions were asked about the methodology, how to come to literature from the basic position of dialectical and historical materialism. A note explaining how literature as a form of social consciousness arises out of social being, which is determined by the interaction of the material and ideological aspects of the social relations of production, was circulated (Appendix VIII). Prof. N.Subramaniam, one of the participant explained the important characterists of Marxist historiography.

Questions were also raised regarding the concept of literary history, as outlined in the first chapter. But the discussion on the concept of social formation, except when referred by Dr. Y.Subbarayalu, was rather slight. Except for the question, how to understand a poet like Kalamekappulavar in the background of this concept, there was hardly any discussion on the theoretical aspect.

The contribution of Dr. Y.Subbarayalu for the discussion of the fourth paper helped to understand the socio-historical perspectives of the periodization suggested in a better manner.

Commenting on the period 600 - 1400 A.D. mentioned in the chapter, he said that it would not be historically correct to take such a long span of time as one period. He referred to the phasing of this period done by Noboru Karashima, in the latter's research papers. Dr. Subbarayalu was of the opinion that it would be better to take it in the following manner:

(a) 600 - 1000 A.D.

When the dominant form of ownership was the communal ownership & property

(b) 1000 - 1200 A.D.

when there was a break down in the communal ownership and a rise in private holdings and

(c) 1200 - 1300 A.D.

when there was a transitional stage

He referred to the paucity of evidence for a detailed study of the period 1300 - 1400 and said that the new formation was clearly seen in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

He also referred to the debate on the Asiatic mode and informed that intensive studies are being done in that field.

He gave detailed information relating to the inscriptional evidences of the late Cola period for the bitter social struggles that were going on in the various parts of the Cola empire and requested that investigations be made to find out why and how those do not get reflected in literature. He was emphasising the role, a proper historical study of literature could play in filling the gaps in the social history of Tamilnadu.

He referred to the paucity of evidence for a detailed study of the period 1300 - 1400 and said that the new formation was clearly seen in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

He also referred to the debate on the Asiatic mode and indicated that intensive studies are necessary in that field.

He gave detailed information relating to the inscriptional evidences of the late Cola period for the bitter social struggles that were going on in the various parts of the Cola empire and requested that investigations be made to find out when and how these developments get reflected in literature. He was emphasising the role a proper historical study of literature could play in filling the gaps in the social history of Tamilnadu.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

CHAPTER - I

1. David Craig, *Marxists on Literature*, Penguin, 1975, P.11.

2. Knights, L.C., *Literature and the Teaching of Literature* in Richards, I.A.--Essays in His Honour (ed), Reuben Browen *et.al*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1973, p.278.

3. Maria Kurginyan, *Sociological Analysis of works of Art in Western researches today* in Aesthetics and the development of Literature (Problems of the Contemporary World No.65), Moscow, 1980, p.145.

4. Attempts have been made in the various histories of Tamil Literature to paint a picture of literary gloom in Tamilnadu in 15th, 16th, 17th centuries (A.D) because of the political confusion that was seen during the period.

5. Jana Sundaram's writings on the literary history of the Cankam Period (Cikaram--Madras 1975-76) reveal this tendency. Even such a talented literary historian as G.Kesavan in his work 'Pallu Illakkiam' has not been able to free himself from this 'mirror-reflection' syndrome. Perhaps the fault lies with those critics-cum-historians of the early sixties (the present writer included) who emphasised on the social links of literature. With no 'creative leap' in subsequent criticism, this was made a formula. And now, it has become an easy point for the non and the anti-Marxist to taunt these critics and Marxism itself.

6. Raymond Williams--*Base and Superstructure*- - in New Left Review--No.82, Nov-December, 1973, London.

7. Benjamin, W--Angelus Novus-Frankfurt, 1966, P. 456. q.v.Ralph Cohen (ed). *New Directions in Literary History*, London, 1974, p.13. The word 'organon' is significant. It is the title of the Aristole's logical writings.

8. See Note (6)

9. Robert Weimann, *Past Significance and Present Meaning* in Ralph Cohen (ed), *New Directions in Literary History*, --London, 1974, P.56 (emphasis added).

10. Jauss-*ibid*. P.36.

11. Harry Levin, *Literature as an Institution in E & T Burns* (ed), *Sociology of Literature and Drama*, Penguin, 1973, p.62.

12. Pletnikov, Yu.K. Social Relations in Philosophy in USSR, Problems of Historical Materialism, Moscow, 1981.

13. Hamza Alavi--The Structure of Colonial Formation--Paper written for the conference on under-development, University of Bielifield, 1979.

14. Ralph Cohen, Introduction, *New Directions in Literary History*, Maryland (USA) 1974, P.2.

15. See chapter III for a full discussion of this problem.

16. Michael Drake (ed), *Applied Historical Studies*--Methuen--London, 1973.--Introduction.

17. V.Kanakasabhai Pillai - *The Tamils 1800 years ago*--Madras, 1904.

T.R.Sesha Iyengar - *Dravidian India*--Madras, 1925.

M.Srinivasa Iyengar-- *Tamil Studies* --Madras, 1914.

P.T.Srinivasa Iyengar-*History of the Tamils*-Madras, 1929.

18. Ka.Naa.Subramaniyam-- *Vimarcanak Kalai* --Madras, 1959.

19. K.Sivathamby --*Ilakkiyamum Karuttu Nilaiyum*-- Madras, 1982, P.8-10.

20. For a clear knowledge of development of literary history as part of Western literary scholarship see Rene Wellek--*A History of Modern Criticism*, Vol. I (1955), Vol. II (1955), Vol. III (1966), Jonathan Cape, London.

21. *Ibid* Vol. IV, p.29.

22. Rene Wellek And Austin Warren--*Theory of Literature*--Penguin, 1980, P.254.

23. Rene Wellek, *The Fall of Literary History* in Richard Amacher & Victor Lange (ed), *New Perspectives in German Criticism* -Princeton, 1979.

24. *Ibid.*

25. Harry Levin in Selected Readings, *Sociology of Literature and Drama* (ed), E & T. Burns, Penguin, P.63.

26. See George C.Grabowicz--*Towards a History and Ukranian literature*--Harward University Press, 1981.

27. David Craig, Q.V. (ed), *Marxists on Literature*, P.134.

28. *Ibid.*

29. Steven Marcusin E & T Burns (ed), loc.cit, P.132-135.

30. Ralph Cohen--Op.cit.,P.9.(emphasis added)

31. *Ibid.* pp.43-61.

32. Reference is made here to the manner late T.K. Chidambara Natha Mudaliyar with the text of Kambaramayanam --See S.Vaiyapurippallai's *Kamban Kaviyam.*

33. Maraimalai Atikal *Murkala, Pirkalat Tamilp Pulavar,* Kazhagam, 1957, P.136.

34. Literature especially in the present context of alienation, is bound also to have this escapist function. The entire industry of mass-literature proves this. But in the pursuit of literary history we are concerned with the more constructive, and socially gainful uses of literature.

CHAPTER - II

1. Kamil Zvelebil, Tamil Literature in the series--A *History of Indian Literature* (Vol.X), Wiesbaden, 1974, p.2.

2. Rene Wellek, *The Rise of English Literary History*, University of North Carolina Press, USA, 1941, p.1 (emphasis added).

3. *Plutarch's Lives and Aristotle's Poetics.*

4. It is a pity that not even introductory research has been done in Hindu-Islamic acculturation in Tamilnadu. The presence of Tulukka-Nacciyar worship in places like Madurai deserves close study. In this connection it is interesting to note that at Madurai there is a festival in which Alagar (Visnu) is supposed to have gone to the house of his concubine (Tulukka Nacciyar) and as expatiatory punishment, is kept outside the usual place when he is worshipped.

5. R.Wellek op.cit. p.2.

6. For a full discussion of the significance of Christianity in Tamil literary tradition see, D.Rajarigam -- *The History of Tamil Christian Literature*, *Madras* 1958.
   K.Sivathamby - கிறிஸ்தவத் தமிழ் இலக்கியப் பாரம்பரியம்-in தமிழ் இலக்கியத்தில் மதமும் மானிடமும்
   to be published shortly by Tamil Puthakalayam, Madras.

7. Mylai Ceeni Venkatacami, *Pattonpatam Nurrantil Tamil Ilakkiyam*, Madras, 1962, p.91-92.

8. John Murdoch, *Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books with Introductory Notices*, 1865 (Reprinted, 1968) p.lix

9. Percival Spear, *A History of India*, Vol.II, Pelican

10. For detailed academic discussion relating to the Cankam Anthologies see J.R.Marr--The *Eight Tamil Anthologies with special reference to Purananuru and Patirrupattu* (thesis approved for Ph.D., London), 1958.
K.Zvelebil, Tamil *Literature*, Leiden, 1975, Chap.VI
S.Vaiyapuripillai, *History of Tamil Language & Literature* NCBH, Madras, 1956.
Jesudasan C&H, *A History of Tamil Literature* Chapter I, YMCA, Calcutta, 1861.
K. Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*, NCBH, Madras, 1981, Chapter III.

11. K. Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*, p.84.

12. Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil Literature*--p.83.

13. *Canka Ilakkiyam*, Saiva Siddhanta Maha Sangam--Madras, 1940, p.1370-1373, edited by S.Vaiyapuripillai.

14. For AN there is a categorization based on the thematics and 'tonics' of the poems--*Kalirruyanai nirai, Manimidai pavalam, and Nittilakkovai.*

15. The traditional reference is made thus *"Ittokai mutitran Purikko"* which should be translated as "It was Purikko who completed/did the collection". The name Purikko does not come in the anthology either as a poet or as one of the King's personnel.

16. Kamil Zvelebil- *Tamil Literature*, p.83.

17. Jan. Vansina, *The Oral Poetry*, London, 1966.

18. K.A.Nilakanta Sastri, *History of South India*, 1966, p.117.

19. K.Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*, p.175 ff.

20. K.Kailasapathy, *Tamil Heroic Poetry*, Oxford, 1968.

21. Rm.Sundaram, *Col Putitu Cuvai Putitu*, Madras, 1978, p.93-128.
See also Kamil Zvelebil, *The smile of Murugan*, Leiden, 1973, p.46 & 47.

22. *Iraiyanar Akapporul*, Kazhagam, 1964.

23. It is important to know that the environs of Madurai were the areas of Jaina activities at the start. Prof.V.I.Subramoniam in a discussion expressed the view that the very association of Madurai with the Cankam legend was inescapable because of its Jaina connections. There was a determined effort at later times to make it a hallowed centre of the Hindus. This seems true because we have instance of the Saivaites taking over Jaina centres and instituting temples there. One such instance could be seen at Trichy, originally Cirapalli, it had many Jaina abodes. The Malaikkoil was indispectably a Jain cult centre. The Jaina memory lingers also in the name of the road adjacent to temple to the west of the Teppakulam--Nandi Koil Street.

24. See A.Chakravarthi N.A., *Jaina Literature in Tamil*, Arrah (Bihar), 1941, *T.P.Meenakshisundaram Commentorial Ilakkiya Varalaru*
Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil in 550 A.D.--Prague.*

25. The first to mention it was M.Seshagiri Sastri in his *Essay in Tamil Literature--Madras*, 1894, p.43.

It is equally important to know that Seshagiri Sastri was the first to refer to the *Gajabahu synchronism in Mahavamsa* in favour of a 2nd c. date for Cilapattikaram, p.30-33.

26. See K.Kailasapathy, *Palantamilar Valvum Valipadum*

27. M.Rasamanickanar, *Saiva Samaya Valarcci.*

28. See K.A.N.Sastri--*Culture and History of the Tamils,* Calcutta, 1963, C.Minakshi, *Administration and Social Life Under the Pallavas.*

29. Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil 550 A.D.* Dissertationes Orientales, Vol. 3, Prague--1964.

30. For the growing socio-economic significance of the temple see C.Minakshi, *Administration and Social Life Under the Pallavas,* Madras, (Reprint, 1977) and Nilakanta Sastri, *Colas,* Madras (Reprint, 1975).

31. See the verse in *Tirukkovaiyar* starting with 'புறங்கிடந்தானடி காண்பான்'

32. Nilakanta Sastri, *Colas,* p.637.

33. K.Vellaivaranar, *Panniru Tirumurai Varalaru,* first part--Annamalai, 1962, p.3.

34. N.Jagadeesan, *History of Sri Vaishnavaism in the Tamil Country* (Post--Ramanuja), Madurai, 1977, p.10.

35. M.Srinivasa Aiyengar, *Tamil Studies,* Madras, 1914, p.332.

36. *Ibid,* p.336.

37. Mu.Arunachalam, *Thamil Ilakkiya Varalaru, --Pattam Nurrandu,* Mayuram, 1972, p.470-72.

38. Nilakanta Sastri, *Colas*, p.638.

39. A.V.Subramania Iyer would place Nathamuni as a contemporary of Rajendra I (1014-1044), *Tamil Araicciyin Valarcci*,Madras, 1971.

40. Vellaivaranar, op.cit. p.12 & 13.
It is interesting to note tnat the lady was after being brought to the temple (at Tiruerukkatampuliyur) kept at the entrance to the temple.. Perhaps the Panar were not allowed to enter the temples. She was taken to Chidambaram only on the orders of the divine Voice.

41. Jagadeesan,op.cit p.398.

42. *Ibid.*,

43. For a detailed study of these see M.Rasamanickanar, *Saiva Camaya Valarcci*, V.Paranjothi, *Saiva Siddhantha* and K.M.Balasubramaniam, *Lectures on Saiva Siddhanta.*

44. Kailasapathy had done a preliminary analysis in this respect. See *Palantamilar Valvum Valipadum.*

45. I am grateful to A.Marx and B.Velusamy for the interesting discussions I have had with them regarding this question.

46. N.Jagadeesan's study is a significant introduction in this field.

47. Having been unable to obtain a copy for perusal, I had the good fortune of discussing about this work with the collaborator of the late S.Vaiyapuripillai, Vidwan M.Shanmugampillai, presently Professor of Manuscriptology, in the Tamil University.

48. For a detailed study of the commentators see M.V.Narasimhan, *Urai Aciriyarkal*, Chidambaram, II ed, 1977.

49. *Tamil Navalar Caritai* (edited by Ti.Ta.Kanagasundarampillai), Madras, 1921.

50. D.Rajarigam, *the History of Tamil Christian Literature*, C.L.S., Madras, 1958.

51. Ibid., f.n.26 p.64, See also K.Meenakshisundaram. *The contribution of European Scholars to Tamil*, Madras, 1974, p.23. Wherein he quotes Sathianathaiyer in the 18th century the attitude of Englishmen towards Indians changed from indifference in the beginning to close contact".

52. Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil Literature*, p.2.

53. D. Rajarigam, op.cit. p.22.

54. See F.B.J.Kuiper, *Dutch Studies in Tamil* Thaninayagan (ed), *Tamil studies Abroad* and also Zvelebil, *Tamil Literature*, 1975, p.4.

55. K.Nambi Arooran, *Kural and Kindersely--A New Frontier* in Professor T.K.Venkatraman's 81st Birthday commemoration Volume. Madurai, 1981.

56. K.Meenakshisundaram, *The Contribution of European Scholars to Tamil*, Madras, 1974, p.40.

57. See.K.Meenakshisundaram's work for further details. See also Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy's *Kristavamum Tamilum*.

58. Avvai Duraiswamy Pillai (ed) *Thamil Navalar Caritai*, Kazhagam, 1949.

59. Eugene F.Irschick, *Politics and Social Conflict in South India*, University of California Press, 1969, p.11.

60. T.R.Venkata Rama Sastri, *Historic Roots of Some Moaern Conflicts*, Madras, 1949.

61. K. Sivathamby, *Tanittamil Iyakkattin Araciyat Pinnani*, Madras, 1979.

62. K.Sivathamby, Hindu Tamil response to Christian Proselytization and Westernization in late nineteenth century, A study of the socio-educational activities of Arumuga Navalar (1822-1879). Social Sciences Review, Vol.I, No.I, Colombo, 1980.

63. It is interesting to note that Arumuga Navalar himself was anti-Brahmin in the sense that he felt that any Brahmin by virtue of birth alone (and not without adequate training and proficiency) should not be a priest. Navalar had a bias towards the Saiva Kurrukals--See K.Sivathamby's *Camooka Iyal Nokkil Navalar*. Navalar Centenary Commemoration--Volume, Jaffna, 1979.

64. T.R.Sesha Iyangar, *The Ancient Dravidian*, Madras, 1925.

65. Sesha Iyengar seems to be a Vaisnavaite Brahmin. It is significant to note that unlike the Saivaite Brahmins. The Vaisnavaite Brahmins take a more liberal attitude towards the Tamilian claims. M.Raghava Iyengar, Ra.Raghava Iyengar, P.T.Srinivasa Iyengar and T.R.Sesha Iyengar could be cited as revealing this tendency. It would be of interest to investigate whether these scholars were Tenkalai Brahmins. The Tenkalai Sect of Vaisnavaism takes the hymns of the Alvars as one of the primary sources of their religion.

66. T.R.Sesha Iyengar, *op.cit*, p.30-1.

67. *Ibid.*, p.45-6.

68. G.R.Arnold Sathasivam Pillai, *Pavalar' Carittira Theepakam*, Manipay, 1886.

69. P.Sundaram Pillai--*some Milestones*, Second Ed. 1895, Preface written on 24-3-1893.

70. T.Chelvakkesvaraya Mudaliyar, *Tamil-An Essay*, Madras, 1904, Introduction.

71. *Ibid.*

72. M.S.Purnalingam Pillai, *po.cit.*

73. G.S.Duraiswamy Pillai--*Tamil Ilakkiyam*, YMCA Press, Calcutta, 1923.

74. P.Sundaram Pillai, *The Age of Tirgnanasambandha*, The Indian Antiquary, May, 1896.

75. V.Kanakasabhai Pillai, *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, Madras, 1904, p.2 & 3.

76. K.G.Sesha Aiyar, *Cera Kings of the Sangam Period*, Luzae, London, 1937.

77. See K.A.N.Sastri, *Studies in Cola History and Administration*, Madras, 1932. The very first chapter deals with this problem.

78. *Ibid.*, p.18.

79. Max Muller, *The six systems of Indian Philosophy*, Longmanns Green & Co, Madras, 1919. The preface is dated 1899. Emphasis added.

80. For more details of Simon Casie Chitty see P.Poologasingham, *Thamil Ilakkiyattil Eelaththarignarin Muyartcikal*, Dec., 1970. Also F.X.C.Nadarjahs "The Scholarship of Simon Casie Chitty", Tamil Culture, September, 1952.

81. The present edition available is the one in which the late Professor T.P.Meenakshisundaram has written notes on the original text of Casie Chitty. The edition carries a forward of Swami Vipulananda, The Tamil Plutarch, Colombo, 1946.

82. This book has been re-edited by P.Poologasingham in two volumes , 1977 and 1980. Poologasingham has given extensive critical notes.

83. See note (73).

84. For biography of Kumaraswamy Pulavar see Ambalavanar,*Kumaraswamy Pulavar, Jaffna, Kumaraswamy Pulavar, Tamil Pulavar Carittiram*, Kokuvil-- (Jaffna - Srī Lanka), 1916.

85. A reprint of the book has been issued by the Tamil Development and Research Council, Government of Tamilnadu, 1968 (ed, M.Shanmukham).

86. M.Srinivasa Aiyangar, *Tamil Studies*, p.193 & 4.

87. Nilakanta Sastri, *Studies in Cola History and Administration*, Madras, 1932, p.4.

88. R.Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages*, in hi. Reprint,1982, p.126.

89. He stated this in his first edition. There were objections to it. In the second edition (1875) he reiterated the same view, *Ibid*, p.143.

90. P.Sundarampillai. The Age of Thirugnana Sambandha--The Indian Antiquary, May 1896. It should be noted that Sundarampillai in a footnote (28) in that article refers to the passing away of Caldwell and says thus: "The loss to the Tamil language and literature by the death of this venerable Tamil Scholar is really great and it may be long before that language finds so devoted a student and patient inquirer as the Right Rev.Bishop Caldwell".

91. Pope, *Tiruvacakam* (Tr) P.lxx II.

92. S.K.Aiyangar's *Kadai Vallalar Kalam*, Centamail Pirasuram (1924) was an expanded Tamil version of the reply he wrote to Innis.

93. K.G.Sesha Aiyar, Manickavasagar and his date, Tamilian Antiquary. Vol.I, No.4.

94. M.Srinivasa Aiyangar, *Tamil Studies*, p.385.

95. R.Swaminatha Aiyar, *Dravidian Theories*, Madras, 1974, p.538.

96. This book though written in that phase was published only in 1974. The author had however published many articles challenging Caldwell's theories during his lifetime. see T.R.Sesha Iyengar in the second edition of his book *Dravidian India* p.65ft. It is this edition of the book that has been reprinted by the Asian Educational Services, New Delhi, 1982.

97. M.Seshagiri Sastri, *Essay on Tamil Literature*, 1894, p.39.

98. This is taken from the edition published in 1953 but the preface is dated 6.6.1930.

99. See K.Sivathamby, *Tanittamil Iyakkattin Araciyat Pinnani*, Madras, 1978, for how the clash between the theis--Tamileuits and the atheistic rationalists rose. As for the critical manner the Periyar tradition looks at such glorified institution as Tolkappiyam and Tirukkural see V.Anaimuttu, *Tamilar Panpattil Puratchi*, Trichy. I am thankful to Dr. T.Moorthy of the Tamil University for making it available.

100. Romila Thapar, "Interpretations of Ancient Indian History"--History and Theory, Vol. VII, No.2, 1968.

101. G.Devaneyan (Devanayappavanar) when writing on who are qualified to write histories of literature, rules many types of persons, one of whom is "தமிழைக் காட்டிக் கொடுக்கும் வையாபுரிகள்".

See his book *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru*, N.Arcot, 1979.

102. S.Vaiyapuripillai, *Tiravitamolikalil Araicci*, Madras 1946, p.11.

103. A collection of his articles published in the journal of the Annamalai University (1937) has been brought now in book form. The papers of Dr.Navalar Somasundara Bharatiyar selected by S.Sambasivam, Madurai, 1967.

104. I am obliged to my friend A.Marx for raising this problem in the course of one of our many discussions on the post-Bharathi period.

105. See his *Thamil Cudarmanikal.*

106. See his *Kandalur Salai.*

107. Vaiyapuripillai edited 21 works between 1929 and 1939 of these atleast nine were brought

out for the first time. See V.Sarojini, *Vaiyapuri-pillai Valkkaikkurippukal*, Madras, 1957, p.41. I am thankful to Sri A.R.Muthukkumarasamy, Librarian, Maraimalai Atikal Memorial Library and General Manager SISSWPS for giving these figures.

108. See Note 103.

109. S.Vaiyapuripillai--Recent progress in Research Studies in Tamil Culture Vol. I, No.I, 1952. This was a revised of his presidential address, Dravidian Languages and Culture Section of the All India Oriental Conference held in Lucknow (1951). His target to attack is not Tamil scholars alone. He refers to a Professor from Kerala, who considered any inscriptions against his views suprious.

110. V.Sarojini, op.cit. p.123.

111. V.I.Subramoniam, *Landmarks in the History of Tamil Literature*, IATR, 1968.

112. K.Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*, p.74. K.Sivathamby, Vaiyapuripillai's dating of Cilappatikaram in Vidyodaya Journal of Arts, Letters and Science, Vol.3, 1977.

113. V.I.Subramoniam, *loc. cit.*

114. A.L.Basham (1) *The History and Doctrine of the Ajivikas*, 1951, London. (2) *The Wonder that was India*, 1954. (3) *Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture.*

115. F.Gros, *A French Approach to Tamil Studies*, Pondicherry, 1981, p.8.

116. George L.Hart III (a) *The poems of Ancient Tamil*, California, 1975. (b) *Poets of the Tamil Anthologies*, Princeton, 1979.

117. V.I.Subramoniam, loc-cit.

118. N.Subramania Aiyar, *Eelathil Tamil Naval*, 1977, K.Sockalingam, *Eelathil Nataka Ilakkiyam*, 1978, K.Sivathamby, *Eelathil Thamil Ilakkiyam*, 1978.

119. Notably the work done at Madurai University; University of Jaffna. The International Institute of Tamil Studies also has been doing useful work in this area.

120. For a history of Malasian Tamil Literature, See M.Ramaiah, *Malaysiattamil Ilakkiyavaralaru*, Salem, 1978.

CHAPTER - III

1. The late S.Vaiyapuri Pillai had, already advocated for the undertaking of a work of that type.

2. No reference is made here to the text books on history of literature.

3. References to literary works largely come in the commentaries; some reference could also be seen in inscriptions.

4. Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy, *Maraintu Pona Tamil Nulkal* -- I ed., 1959; II ed., 1967.

5. K.Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*, pp. 86-87.

6. N.Subramaniam, *An Introduction to Tamil Literature*, C.L.S. 1981, Preface.

7. David Craig , *The real foundation -- Literature and Social Change*, London, 1973, p. 287.

8. See his *History of Tamil Literature*.

9. Bror Tiliander -- *Christian and Hindu Terminology* --a study in their mutual relations with special reference to Tamil area. Uppsala 1974, I am grateful to D.Packiyamuthu for drawing my attention to this work.

10. T.S.Satyam, *Irupatam Nurrantil Tirukkural Araicciyin Valarcci* --Thesis (Unpublished) submitted to the degree of Ph.D., University of Madras, 1979.

11. E.H.Welkins -- *A History of Italian Literature* O.U.P., 1954 - Introduction.

12. P.S.Subramanya Sastri, *Vatamoli Ilakkiya Varalaru* -- Annamalai University.

13. I am thankful to Professor S.M.Katre for this information.

14. K.Kunjunni Raja, *The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature*, University of Madras, second (ed.) 1980.

15. Sri Shanmuganathan (Bharathi Pittan), Principal Tiruvaiyaru college of Tamil and Music informs me that it is a general belief among the residents that the association Thiyagarayar had with the Nadeswaram players (The Melakarar) of Tiruvaiyaru also helped to shape his musical career.

16. A few articles have been written on this subject. See N.Subramaniam, IATR, 1969.

17. A.C.Chettiar -- *Advanced Studies in Tamil Poetry*, Annamalai University.

18. I attempted a preliminary survey of this type for Sri Lankan Literature. See Chapter 3 *Eelathin Akka Ilakkiya Nul Veliuyeedu* (1948-1970) in my *Eelathil Tamil Ilakkiyam*, Madras, 1978.

19. For a detailed study see R.Hoggart, *Uses of Literacy*--Penguin.

20. This is not the place to enter into the question of the difference between 'Pop' and 'Serious' literature.

CHAPTER - IV

(1) Hindess and Hirst, *Precapitalist Modes of Production*, London -1975, p. 309.

(2) Nilakanta Sastri, *The Culture and History of the Tamils*, Calcutta,1963.

(3) Hindess and Hirst, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

(4) Philosophy in the USSR, *Problems of Historical Materialism*, Moscow,1981, P. 51.

(5) Mode of production is the historically conditioned manner of obtaining the material goods necessary for production and for personal consumption. It is the sum of productive forces and productive relations, which are inter-connected and inter-dependent.

(6) Maurice Godelier, *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*, Cambridge, 1979, p. 63.

(7) Senake Bandaranaike, *The Periodization of Sri Lankan history and some related historical problems* -- Paper read at the Evelynn Rutnam Institute, Jaffna in January, 1982. (Unpublished). I am grateful to Dr.S.Bandaranaike for making it available to me.

(8) This idea of describing the Post-Cankam pre-Pallava period as a dark age has been challenged. Much material has been brought forth and it is no more a dark age in the sense that nothing is known about.

see-K.Sivathamby, *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*.

M.Arunachalam, *The Kalabhras in the Pandya country*, Madras, 1979.

K.R.Venkataraman - *Transactions of the Archaeo logical Society of South India*, 1956-7, p. 94-100.

Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy - *Kalappirar Kalam.*

(9) N. Surbramaniam - *Sources of the History of Tamilnadu* (Ancient Period) in N.R. Ray (ed) *Sources of the History of India, Vol. III*, Calcutta 1980, p. 306 - emphasis added.

(10) Y. Subbarayalu - *Inscriptional Sources for the History of the Colas of the Early Medieval South Indian History* in the same Volume (ed.) N.R. Ray, p. 371 - 379.

(11) See–Dr. O.Ramachandraiyar's *Presidential Address for the South Indian History Congress*, Third Session, Erode, 1982, p. 7&8.

(12) Already three publications have been published -- *Studies in South Cultural Change in Rural Villages in Tiruchirappalli District - India*, No.1 is a significant contribution to the economic history of India.

(13) Kh.Momjan, *Landmarks in History* - Moscow, 1980, p. 46.

(14) Nilakanta Sastri - *The Culture and History of the Tamils*, p.87.

(15) *Ibid*, p.62.

(16) Burton Stein - *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*, O.U.P. - Delhi, 1980, p.67.

(17) See D.Ramachandrayya - *Loc. cit.*

K.Nambi Arooran - *The origin of Three Saiva Mathas in Thanjavur District.*

(18) Nilakanta Sastri, *op. cit.*, p.69.

"The name Baramahal is used to denote the table lands of interior Tamilnadu, a bit to the north west in direction".

N.Guha, Baramahal records. *Loc. cit.* N.R.Ray (ed.) p.401.

(19) D.A.Washbrook - *The Emergence of provincial Politics in the Madras Presidency 1870-1970*, Cambridge - 1976, p.11.

(20) Burton Stein, *op.cit.*, p.75.

Nambi Arooran - *Loc. cit.*

(21) See- N.Vanamamalai's paper on *The Anti Feudal Struggles During the Cola Period - I*, ATR 1968.

(22) Kathleen Gough - *Modes of Production in Southern India* in Economic and Political weekly special supplement, Feb. 1980.

(23) Kathleen Gough - *Rural Society in South East India*, Cambridge, 1981, p.110.

(24) Kathleen Gough - *Loc. cit.*

(25) Karl Marx - *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations.* Holswahm E.G. (ed.), London, 1964, p.83.

(26) Guna - *The Question of the Asiatic Mode* (mimeographed copy), Forum for Research on Tamilnadu, Bangalore, (not dated).

(27) B.Stein, *Essays on South India*, Hawai, 1975.

(28) B. Stein - *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*, p.8.

(29) *Ibid*, p.264.

(30) *Ibid*, p.274.

(31) "Production relations are relations existing between people in the process of the social production, exchange and distribution of material wealth".

(32) K.Sivathamby - *Early South Indian Society & Economy - The Tinai Concept*, Social Scientist, Trivandrum - No.29.

(33) Hobswahm, *op.cit.*, p.61-62.

(34) I am thankful to Professor Romila Thapar for providing a clear in sight into the ideological problems involved in the debate on the Asiatic Mode of Production.

See—Hindess & Hirst - Chapter 4 - *The Asiatic Mode of Production.*

(35) N. Karashima - "The prevalence of private land-owning in the lower Cauveri Valley in the late Chola period and its historical implications" in *Studies in Socio-cultural Change in Rural villages in Tiruchirappalli District - Tamil Nadu, India*, Japan, 1980.

(36) Burton Stein

(37) *Ibid*, p.87.

(38) *Ibid*, p.340-341.

(39) Romila Thapar - *A History of India*, Vol. I, Penguin, 1976, p.197.

(40) *Ibid*, p.194.

(41) Kathleen Gough - *op.cit.*, p.148.

(42) B.Stein, *op.cit.*, p.418.

(43) K.Kailasapathy - *Tamil Heroic Poetry.*

K. Sivathamby -

i) *Early South Indian Society and Economy - Loc. cit.*

ii) *Development of Aristocracy in Ancient Tamil Nad* - Vidyodaya Journal of Arts & Science letters Vol.4, Nos.1 & 2, 1971.

iii) *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society* - Chapter IV.

G.Kesavan - *Mannum Manitha Uravukalum,* Madras, 1980.

M.G.S.Narayanan - *Studies in South Indian History*, Calicut.

APPENDICES

I

A LIST OF SOME OF THE MAJOR PUBLICATIONS OF THE PHASE 1835-1929 DEALING WITH LITERARY HISTORY OF LITERATURE

1856 - Robert Caldwell - *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Language.*

1859 - Simon Casie Chitty - *The Tamil Plutarch* - Ceylon (ed.), T.P. Meenakshisundaram - Colombo, 1946.

1850-
1860 - *Vinota Raca Mancari*- (ed.) M.V.Venugopalapillai, 1953.

1865 - John Murdoch - *Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books with Introductory Notices* - Madras, 1865, Reprint, 1968.

1881 - Robert Caldwell - *A History of Tinnevely* (Reprint, 1981).

1886 - J.R. Arnold - *Pavalar Carittira Theepakam (The Galaxy of Tamil Poets), Manipay, 1886.*

1890-
1895 - T.Chelvakkesavaraya Mudaliyar - A Series *of Articles in Tamil in Swadesamitran,* Published as a book in 1901 and in 1931.

1891 - P. Sundarampillai - *Some Milestones in the History of Tamil Literature* (first written on the issue of the Age of Tirugnana Sambandha first published as monograph in 1891, Second edition, 1895).

1894 - M. Seshagiri Sastri - *Essay on Tamil Literature*- SPCK Press, Madras.

1895-
1901 - V. Kanakasabhai Pillai's *Tamil Eighteen Hundred Years Ago* appeared as a serial in the *Madras Review.* First published as a book in (1904) Higgonbotham & Co., Madras.

1899 - Capapati Navalar - *Tiravitappirakasikai* (Reprint, 1960, Kazhagam).

1900 - G.U. Pope (Trans. and ed.)-*The Tiruvacakam*- Oxford, Calarendon Press.

1901 - Murugadasa Swamikal *alias* Dandapany Swamikal (1840 - 1899) *Pulavar Puranam Second* by T.M. Senthinayakam Pillai, 1908.

1903 - *The starting of Centamil* - A Journal of the Tamil Cankam - Inaugurated with the aid of Pandithurai thevar (1901).

1904 - Chengalveraya Pillai - *History of the Tamil Prose Literature* - Reprint, 1928, Town Press, Conjeevaram.

1905 - M.S.Purnalingam Pillai - *A Primer of Tamil Literature*- Madras, 1904.

1909 - K.G.Sesha Iyer - *Manickavasagar and his date.*

1909 - S.K. Aiyangar - *Augustan Age of Tamil Literature*. (The first one is published as Vol.I No.4 and the other one as Vol.I No.5 of Tamilian Antiquary).

1912 - Somasundara Bharathy - *Tamil Classics.*

1913 - Mu.Raghava Iyengar - *Velir Varalaru,* Centamil Piracuram.

1914 - M.Srinivasa Iyengar - *Tamil Studies,* Madras.

1916 - A.Kumarasami Pulavar, *Tamil Pulavar Carittiram.*

1917 - Ra. Raghava Iyengar - *Vanci Manakar.*

1917 - S.Krishnaswamy Iyengar - *The Chronology of the Sangam works, so called of Tamil Literature.* Lecture delivered at pachaiyappa's College on 7-3-1917. Published in Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture, Poona, 1941.

1917 - K.V. Subramania Iyer - *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan,* Madras.

1918 - S.Krishnaswamy Iyengar - *Beginnings of South Indian History.*

1918 - *Panniru Pulavar Carittiram* - *Vol. II,* Oxford, Madras.

1919 - S.K.Deivasikhamani - *Tamils and their language.*

1922 - M.S.Ramaswami Aiyengar and B.Seshagiri Rao - *Studies in South Indian Jainism* - Madras.

1922 - K.S.Srinivasa Pillai - *Tamil Varalaru* - Tanjore, Ninth Ed., 1968.

1922-
1923 - Publication of R.Swaminatha Iyer's views on *Caldwell's CGDL in Tamilar Nesam,* the journal of the Tamilian Educational Society, Madras (founded in 1917). The writing of the late Swaminatha Iyer have now been well edited and brought out as Dravidian theories, Madras Law Journal Office, Madras, 1975.

1923 - G.S.Duraisamy Pillai - *Tamil Ilakkiyam - Canka Kalam.*

1924 - S.Krishnasamy Iyengar - *Kadai Kalam ,* Centamil Publication.

1924 - R.Sathianathaiyar - *History of the Nayaka of Madurai*- O U P, 1974.

1924 - G.Slater - *Dravidian Elements in Indian Culture*- London.

1927 - M.S.Purnalingam Pillai - *Tamil India* - Reprint, 1963.

1928 - P.T.Srinivas Iyengar - *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*- (serialised in journal of Indian History).

1929 - P.T.Srinivas Iyengar - *History of the Tamils* (from the earliest times to 600 A.D).

1929 - M.S.Purnalingam Pillai - *Tamil Literature* (Revised and enlarged) - This is an extended version of his primer of Tamil Literature.

1929 - U.Ve.Caminathai Iyer - *Cankattamilum Pirkalat-tamilum* (lectures given to the University of Madras in 1927), Seventh edition, 1978.

1929 - K.A.Nilakanta Sastri - *The Pandyan Kingdom*- London.

II

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FIRST PRINTING OF SOME OF THE ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL TEXTS

1846-
1850 - *Tolkappiam* - *Eluttatikaram* with the Commentary of Naccinarkkiniyar (ed.) - Malavai Mahalinga Aiyar.

1860 - *Tirukkovaiyar* with commentary by Arumuga Navalar.

1868 - *Tolkappiyam Collatikaram,* Cenavaraiyam, (ed.) - C.W.Thamotherampillai.

1869 -*Tolkappiyam - Eluttatikaram,* Ilampuranam (ed.) Subbaraya Chettiar.

1881 - *Vira Coliyam* - (ed.) C.W.Thamotherampillai.

1883 - *Iraiyanar Kalaviyal* with Commentary (ed.) C.W.Thamotherampillai.

385 - *Tolkappiyam - Porulatikaram* (Naccinarkkiniam & Peraciram) (ed.) - C.W. Thamotherampillai.

1887 - *Kalittokai* - (ed.) C.W.Thamotherampillai.

1887 - *Civakacintamani* (with Naccinarkkiniyar's Commentary) (ed.) - U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.

1889 - *Pattuppattu* (with Naccinarkkiniyar's Commentary) (ed.) U.Ve. Caminatha Aiyar.

1892 - *Cilappatikaram - (ed.) U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.*

1894 - *Purananuru* - with old commentary, (ed.) U.Ve. Caminatha Aiyar.

1898 - Manimekalai - (ed.) U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.

1903 - *Ainkurunuru* - (ed.) U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.

1904 - Patirruppattu - (ed.) U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.

1914 - *Narrinai* - (ed.) Pinnattur A.Narayanasamy Aiyar.

1915 - *Kuruntokai* - (ed.) T.S.Arasakasamy Aiyengar.

1918 - *Paripatal* - (ed.) U.Ve.Caminatha Aiyar.

1920 - *Akananuru* - (ed.) Ra.Raghava Aiyangar.

III

A LIST OF SOME OF THE MAJOR PUBLICATIONS FROM 1930 TO 1949

DEALING WITH LITERARY HISTORY

1930 - Ka. Cuppiramania Pillai - *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāru* Madras. Revised third edition published in two volumes, Madras, 1949.

1930 - Maraimalai Atikal - *Manickavacakar Kalamum Varalarum* (first edition by Author - Reprint in two volumes - Kazhagam, 1957).

1930 - V. Ramachandra Dikshither - *Studies in Tamil Literature and History* - London.

1931 - K.A.Nilakanta Sastri - *Foreign Notices of South India* - Madras.

1931 - Mu. Raghava Aiyangar - *Alvarkal Kalanilai* - Madras.

1931 - V.G.Suriyanarayana Sastri - *Tamil Moliyin Varalāru* - Madras.

1932 - K.A.N. Sastri - *Studies in Cola History & Administration.*

1932 - K.N.Sivarajapillai - *The Chronology of the Early Tamils* - Madras.

1933 - V. Venkatarajulu Reddiar - *Paranar* - Madras.

1933 - V.G.Suriyanarayana Sastri - *Tamil Pulavar Carittiram* - Madras (This book has an article on the need for a history of literature, written in Ananda Bodhini).

1934 - T.N.Thanu Ammal - *Pirkālaccolarum Ilakkiya Valarcciyum*-Madras.

1934 - M.Balasubramania Mudaliyar - *Canka Nurpulavar Peyar Akarāti*-Madras.

1935 - K.A.Nilakanta Sastri - *Colas*-Madras.

1936 - Somasundara Desikar - *Thamilppulavarkal Varalaru - Mutar Pakuthi, Patinaram Nurrantu.*

1936 - C.V.Narayana Aiyar - *Origin and Early History of Saivaism in South India* Madras.

1936 - Na.Kanagaraja Iyer - *Thamil Pulavarkal Varalaru - Mutar Pakuthi.*

1937 - M.Raghava Aiyangar - *Cacanat Tamil Kavi Caritam*-Madras.

1937 - K.G. Sesha Aiyar - *Cera Kings of the Sangam Period*-London.

1937 - Somasundara Desikar - *Tamilppulavarkal - Patinetam nurrantu*, Madras.

1938 - Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy - *Krishtavamum Tamilum*-Madras.

1938 - C.Minakshi - *Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas.*

1938 - C.Kanesa Aiyar - *Eelanaatuttamilpulavar Carittiram*-Chunnakam.

1939 - *Ancient and Modern Tamil Poets* - Kazhagam.

1940 - T.V.Mahalingam - *Administration and Social Life Under the Vijayanagar*-Madras.

1940 - T.V.Sadhasıva Pandarattar - *Pandiar Varalāru*- Madras, 1940.

1940 - Mylai Ceeni Venkatacamy - *Pauttamum Tamilum*- Madras.

1941 - R.Raghava Aiyangar-*Tamil Varalāru* - Annamalai.

1941 - A.Chakravarti - *Jaina Literature in Tamil*- Arrah (Bihar).

1945 - P.S.Subramanya Sastri - *Historical Tamil Reader*- Annamalai.

1946 - *Thamilppulavar Varicai Ist Book and IInd book* - Kazhagam.

1947 - S.Vaiyapuri Pillai - *Ilakkiyaccintanai* - Madras.

1948 - *Thamilppulavar Varicai* - Kazhagam.

1948 - S.Vaiyapuripillai - *Tamilin Marumalarcci*.

1948 - *S.Vaiyapuripillai* - *Tamilccudarmanikal*.

1949 - S.Vaiyapuripillai - *Thamilar Panpadu*.

1949 - Ma. Irasamonikampillai, *Pallavar Varalaru*-Madras, 1949.

1949 - *T.V.Sadhasiva Pandarattar* - Pirkala Colar Varalāru.

IV

The following is the print history of the *Ilakkiyaccorpolivukal* (Lectures on Literatures) which popularised the ancient and medieval literatures among the growing Tamil Literates.

Akananooruccorpolivukal	- 1940, 1946, 1947.
Purananooruccorpolivukal	- 1944, 1948, 1956, 1966.
Paripatalccorpolivukal	- 1955, 1961.
Kalittokaiccorpolivukal	- 1940, 1943, 1950, 1959, 1970.
Kuruntokaiccorpolivukal	- 1940, 1948, 1957, 1972.
Narrinaiccorpolivukal	- 1942, 1950, 1957, 1975.
Ainkurunuruccorpolivukal	- 1955, 1965.
Patirruppattuccorpolivukal	- 1955, 1966.
Pattuppattuccorpolivukal	- 1952, 1957, 1969.
Patinenkilkkanakkuc-corpolivukal	- 1956, 1966.
Cirrilakkiyaccorpolivukal	- 1) 1959, 1968, 1971.
	- 2) 1959
	- 3) 1960, 1962.
	- 4) 1961
	- 5) 1962
	- 6) 1964

(The author wishes to thank Sri. R.Muthu Kumaraswamy, General Manager of the SISSWPS for printing these figures).

V

THE CHRONOLOGY OF S.VAIYAPURIPILLAI'S WORKS

1946 - *Dravida Molikalil Āraichi*

1947 - *Ilakkiya Cintanai*

1948 - *Tamilin Marumalarcci*

1948 - *Tamilccudarmanikal*

1949 - *Tamilar Panpādu*

1950 - *Ilakkiya Udayam I*

1952 - *Ilakkiya Udayam II*

1954 - *Ilakkiya Theepam*

1954 - *Ilakkiya Manimalai*

1956 - *History of Tamil Language and Literature*

1956 - *Ilakkanaccintanaikal*

1956 - *Kamban Kaviam*

1956 - *Corkalai Virunthu*

1957 - *Corkalin Saritham*

1957 - *Kāviya Kalam*

VI

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOME OF THE WORKS PUBLISHED ON TAMIL LITERARY HISTORY AFTER 1950

1950 - *Cennait tamil pulavarkal*

		- *I Book*
1951 -		- *Cennait tamil pulavar-kal - II Book*
1951 -	V.Chelvanayakam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru*
1952-1956 -	(Part I to Part IV)	- *Cankat Tamil Pulavar Varicai*
1953 -	S.A.Ramasamy Pulavar	- *Tamil Pulavar Carittiram - IV Book*
1953 -	M.M.U. Wise	- *Muslim contribution to Tamil Literature*
1953 -	L.Renou (ed.)	- *L'Inde*
1954 -	S.Ramasamy Naidu	- *Tamil Ilakkiyam*
1954 -	Mylai Cenni Venkatacamy	- *Camanamum Tamilum*
1954 -	S.Vithiananthan	- *Tamilar Salbu*
1955 -	K.R.Govindan	- *Ilakkiya Valarcci*
1955 -	T.V.Sadasiva Pandarattar	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru (250-600 A.D)*
1955 -	S.A.Ramasamy pulavar	- *Tamilppulavar varicai*
1955 -	T.V.Sadasiva Pandarattar	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru*
1956 -	Somaley	- *Valarum Tamil*

1956 -	Ka.Po.Rathinam	- *Ilankayil Inbattamil*
1957 -	V.Chelvanayakam	- *Tamil Urainadai Varalaru*
1958 -	Ma.Rajamanikkam	- *Kala Araicci*
1958 -	Duraisamy Pillai	- *Saiva Ilakkiya Varalaru*
1959 -	A.V.Subramanya Aiyar	- *Tamil Araicciyin Valarcci*
1959 -	Mylai ceeni Venkatacamy	- *Tamilar Valartha Alaguk-kalaikal*
1959 -	Mylai ceeni Venkatacamy	- *Marainthupona Tamil Nulkal*
1960 -	Gopalakrishnan	- *Kulanthai Ilakkiya Varalaru*
1961 -	C.Jesudasan and Hepzibah Jesudasan	- *A History of Tamil Literature*
1962 -	Vellaivaranar	- *Tirumurai Araicci*
1962 -	S.Ramakrishnan	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru or Arimukam*
1965 -		- *Makers of Modern Tamil*
1965 -	T.P.Meenakshi-Sundaram	- *History of Literature*
1965 -	Sundara Shanmugam	- *Akarathi Kalai*
1966 -	N.V.Jayaraman	- *Ula Ilakkiankal*

1966 -	A.M.Parama-sivanantham	- *Pettonbatam Nurrantil Tamil Urainatai*
1966 -	Salai Ilanthiraiyan	- *Tamilil Cirukathai*
1966 -	Salai Ilanthiraiyan	- *Cirukathai Chelvam*
1966 -	K.Kailasapathy	- *Palantamilar Valvum Valipadum*
1966 -	K.Sivathamby	- *Tamilil Cirukathayin Thorramum Valarcciyum*
1967 -	K.Kailasapathy	- *Tamil Naval Ilakkiyam*
1968 -	K.Kailasapathy	- *Tamil Heroic Poetry*
1968 -	Sundara Shanmugam	- *A Short History of Lexio-graphy*
1969 -	A.V.Subramania Aiyar	- *Tamil Studies I*
1969 -	M.Arunachalam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru 14th C.*
1969 -	M.Arunachalam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru 15th C.*
1970	A.V.Subramania Aiyar	- *Tamil Studies II*
1971 -	M.Arunachalam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru - 11th C.*
1972 -	Varadharajanar	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru*

1972	T.Packiyamuthu (ed.)	- *Tarkalat Tamil Ilakkiyathil Manithan*
1973	Kamil Zvelebil	- *Smile of Muruga on Tamil Literature of South India*
1973	M.Arunachalam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru 12th C. I book*
1973	N.Vanamamalai (ed.)	- *Tamil Navalkal oru Mathipeedu*
1973	Ira Thandayutham	- *Tharkala Tamil Ilakkiyam*
1974	C.S.Chellappa	- *Tamil Cirukathai Pirak-kirathu*
1975	Salini Ilanthiraiyan	- *Valkai Varalarru Ilakkiyam*
1974	K.Krishnasamy	- *Tamilil Tala Puranankal*
1974	T.Packiyamuthu (ed.)	- *Viduthalaikkuppin Tamil Navalkal*
1974	K.Diraviyam	- *Thesiam Valartha Tamil*
1975	Ira Thandayutham	- *Mu. Va-vin Ilakkiyankal*
1975	M.Arunachalam	- *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru 9th C.*
1976	S.Thothatri	- *Jayakanthan oru Vimar-canam*
1976	Vallikkannan	- *Puthukkavithayin Thorra-mum Valarcciyum*

1976	- T.Murugarathinam	- *Puthumai Pithan Cirukathai Kalai*
1977	- P.G.Sundararajan & Sivapathasundaram	- *Tamil Naval - Nurrandu Varalarum Valarcciyum.*
1978	- K.Sivathamby	- *Eelattil Tamil Ilakkiyam*
1978	- K.Sivathamby	- *Navalum Valkkaiyum*
1978	- Na.Vanamamalai	- *Puthukavithai - Murpokkum, Pirpokkum*
1978	- A.Jagannathan	- *Puthu Kavithai - Oru Thiranaivu*
1978	- Veerasami	- *Malaysia & Tamil Ilakkiya Varalaru*
1979	- G.Kesavan	- *Mannum Manitha Uravukalum*
1979	- M.Vedasakaya Kumar	- *Tamilc Cirukathai Varalaru*
1980	- P.S.Ramaiya	- *Manikodi Kalam*
1980	- V.Jayakumar	- *Pallu Ilakkiyam*
1980	- S.Thothathri	- *Tamil Naval Adipadaikal*
1981	- M.Shunmugam Pillai	- *Cirrilakkiya Valarcci*
1981	- T.P.Meenakshi sundaram	- *Canka kalam*
1981	- K.Sivathamby	- *Drama in Ancient Tamil Society*

1981 - G.Kesavan - *Pallu Ilakkiyam - Oru Camookavialparvai*

VII

1. REV, ROBERT CALDWELL

-- A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages - 1856

1. The JAINA CYCLE (of the Madura Sangam) Ca. 8th c. A.D to Ca 13th c. A.D.

2. THE TAMIL RAMAYANA CYCLE 13th c. A.D.

3. THE SAIVA REVIVAL CYCLE 13th A.D. 14th c. A.D.

4. THE VAISNAVA CYCLE the same time

5. THE LITERARY REVIVAL 15th A.D. - 16th c. A.D.

6. THE ANTI-BRAHMANICAL CYCLE 17th c. A.D.

7. THE MODERN SCHOOL 18th c. A.D.- 19th c. A.D.

2. C.W.TAMODARAM PILLAI

Editorial Commentary to *Viracoliam*, Madurai, 1881.

1. APOTA KALAM (pre-historic) (of spiritual ignorance, pre-Agastyam, pre historic - There was then no alphabet)

2. AKSARA KALAM (Alphabetic)
(From the date of invention of alphabet by Agastya to the period of completion of his grammar).

3. ILAKKANA KALAM (Grammatic)
(The Period of composition of Tamil grammar by Agastya's twelve disciples)

4. CAMUTAYA KALAM (Academic)
B.C. 10, 150 - B.C. 150
(Period of the three Tamil Cankams)

5. ANATARA KALAM (Lethargic)
B.C. 150 - A.D. 50
(Period without any patronage of Tamil letters)

6. CAMANA KALAM (Jain)
A.D. 50 to A.D. 350

7. ITIKASA KALAM (Puranic)
A.D. 350 - A.D. 1150

8. ATIRA KALAM (Monastic)
A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1850

3. V.G.SURIYA NARAYANA SASTIRI (c. 1870 - 1903)

(Q.V) K. ZVELEBIL., TAMIL LITERATURE, LEIDEN, 1975

a) EARLY - 8000 B.C. - A.D. 100
b) MEDIEVAL FIRST HALF - A.D. 100 - A.D. 600, SECOND HALF - A.D. 600 - A.D. 1400
c) MODERN A.D. 1400 onward

4. J.VINSON - 1903 (?)

(Q.V) KAMIL ZVELEBIL - TAMIL LITERATURE, LEIDEN, 1975

1. THE PERIOD OF ESSAYS, PAMPHLETS AND SHORT POEMS
   6th - 7th c. A.D.

2. THE PERIOD OF JAINA PREDOMINANCE
   8th c. A.D.

3. THE PERIOD OF STRUGGLE BETWEEN SAIVAITES AND JAINAS
   9th c. A.D.

4. THE PERIOD SAIVA PREDOMINANCE
   10th c. A.D.

5. THE VAISNAVA PERIOD
   15th - 16th c. A.D.

5. M.S.PURNALINGAM PILLAI

- A PRIMER OF TAMIL LITERATURE, MADRAS, 1904.

1. THE AGE OF SANGAMS
   up to 100 A.D.

2. THE AGE OF BUDDHISTS AND JAINS
   A.D 100 - A.D. 600

3. THE AGE OF RELIGIOUS REVIVAL
   A.D 600 - A.D. 1100

4. THE AGE OF LITERARY REVIVAL
   A.D 1100 - A.D. 1400

5. THE AGE OF MUTTS AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS
   A.D. 1400 - A.D. 1700

6. THE AGE OF EUROPEAN CULTURE
   A.D. 1700 - A.D. 1900

6. M.SRINIVASA AIYANGAR

- TAMIL STUDIES, MADRAS, 1914.

Early

I. ACADEMIC (Cankam Period)
(a) Animistic - B.C. 600 - B.C. 200
(b) Buddhist - B.C. 200 - A.D. 150

II. CLASSIC (Cilappathikaram, Manimekalai, Pattuppattu etc.)
Jaina - A.D. 150 to A.D. 500

Medieval

III. HYMNAL (Bhakti Literature)
Brahmanic - A.D. 500 - A.D. 950

IV. TRANSLATIONS (Kamba Ramayanam, Kachiappa Skantham etc.)
Sectains - A.D. 950 - A.D. 1200

Modern

V. EXEGETICAL (Commentaries of Nacci-narkkiniar, Adiyarkunallar etc.)
Reformatory - A.D. 1200 A.D. 1450

VI. MISCELLANEOUS
Modern - A.D. 1450 - A.D. 1850

7. K.S.SRINIVASA PILLAI

- TAMIL VARALARU - 1922

1. FROM PRIMITIVE PERIOD TO THE END OF CANKAM
i.e. to the end of 300 A.D.
(ET, Pattu, Cil, Mani, Kural-All included)

2. FROM THE END OF CANKAM TO THE END OF 10th c. A.D.

3. FROM THE BEGINNING OF 11th CENTURY A.D. To 14th c. A.D End.

4. From 15th c. A.D. to TILL DATE.

8. MARAI MALAI ADIKAL

- MANICKAVACAGAR VARALARUM KALAMUM - 1930

1. THANITHAMIL KALAM (The Age of Pure Tamil) From the period of Muranjiyur Mudinagarayar (who helped in Maha Bharata War) to Ist c. A.D.

2. BUDDHA KALAM (The Age of Buddhists) Ist c. A.D. - 4th c. A.D.

3. CAMANA KALAM (The Age of Jains) 4th c. A.D. - 7th c. A.D.

4. SAIVA VAINAVA KALAM (The Age of Saivas and Vaisnavas) 7th c. A.D. to 14th c. A.D.

5. PARPANA KALAM (The Age of Brahmins) 14th c. A.D. to 18th c. A.D.

6. ANGILA KALAM (The Age of Europeans) 18th c. A.D. to till date

9. Ka. CUPPIRAMANIYA PILLAI (1930)

ILAKKIYA VARALARU

- Madras 1953 (iv edition)

1. THALAI CANKAMUM IDAI CANKAMUM (First and Second Cankam)

2. KADAI CANKA KALAM
   12th or 15th c. B.C. - 3rd c. B.C. (Period of Last Cankam)

3. MANICKAVACAKAR KALAM
   3rd c. A.D.

4. CAMANAR ATCHI KALAM

5. THEVARA KALAM
   A.D. 570 - A.D. 655

6. ALVARKAL KALAM
   up to A.D. 850

7. THIRUVISAIPAK KALAM
   A.D. 1011

8. SITTAR KALAM

9. SAMANARTHUR NULKILLARCHI (Chivaka-cintamani, Valayapathy, Viracolium etc.)
   10th c. A.D. - 13th c. A.D.

10. SAIVA KAPPIYA KALAM
    11th & 12th c. A.D.
    (Kalinkattuparani, Periapuranam, Kandapuranam, Ottakkuttar, Pugalenthi, Kambar)

10. V.CHELVANAYAKAM

- TAMIL ILLAKKIYA VARALARU - 1951

1. CANKA KALAM (Cankam Period)
   (From first to 3rd Century A.D.)

2. CANKA MARUVIA KALAM, (Post Cankam Period)
   (Thirukkural, Cil, Mani, Karaikkalammaiyar, First three Alwars, Kalittokai, Paripatal. From the end of 3rd c. A.D to the half of 6th c. A.D)

3. PALLAVAR KALAM (Bhakti Hymns etc.)
From the later half of 6th c. A.D. to the first half of 9th c. A.D.

4. COLAR KALAM
(Cil, Cintamani, Kamba Ramayanam, Ottakkuttar, pugalenthi, Viracoliam, Dandiyalankaram etc.)
From the late half of 9th c. A.D. to 14th c. A.D.

5. NAYAKKAR KALAM
(Many of the minor literature, Kandaralankara Tiruppukal, Commentaries etc.)
From the end of 14th c. A.D. to the beginning of the 18th c. A.D.

6. AIROPPIAR KALAM (European Period)
(Christian literature, Sivagnana \Munivar, Vinodarasa Manjari, Veaanayakam Pillai, Thiravida Prakasikai, Kopala Krishna Bharathi, Bharathi, Bharatidasan etc.)
The period after Nayak's till 18th & 19th c. A.D.

11. KAMIL ZVELEBIL

TENTATIVE PERIODIZATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAMIL —TAMIL CULTURE VOL. IV, No.1 - 1957

A. OLD TAMIL Cca 6/7th - c A.D.

1) EARLY OLD TAMIL
3/4th c. A.D.
(Many of the Eight anthologies. and 10 decades)

2) MIDDLE OLD TAMIL
Cca 3/4 c. A.D. - 5/6 A.D.
(Kalittokai, Paripatal, Kural, Kalavazhi etc.)

3) LATER OLD TAMIL
Cca 4/5th c. A.D. - 6/7th c. A.D.
(Naladiyar, Inna Narpathu, Pala Moli, Cil. etc.

B. MIDDLE TAMIL

1) OLD MIDDLE TAMIL
6/7th c. A.D. to 850 A.D.
(Saiva Nayanmar, Vainava Alvar, Perunthevanar Baratam)

2) MIDDLE MIDDLE TAMIL
850 A.D. - 1200 A.D.
(Civaka cintamani, Kamba Ramayanam Peria Puranam Commentaries)

3) OLD MIDDLE TAMIL
1200 A.D. - 1750/1800 A.D.
Sivagnana Bodham, Villipputturar Baratam etc.

C. NEW TAMIL
1750/1800 A.D. to till date
(Beschi, Sivagnana Munivar and others).

12. S.VAIYAPURI PILLAI

-- KAVYAKALAM
-- Madurai, 1957

1. MUR CANKA KALAM (Early Cankam Period)
(Anthologies, Many of the Ten decads)
A.D. 100 - A.D. 350

2. THOKAI CEY KALAM (Period of anthologization)
(Anthologyzing of the pre Cankam works; Narrinai, Kur, Aink, Prrp, Akam, Puram etc.)
A.D. 400 - A.D. 500

3. PIR CANKA KALAM (Later Cankam period)
(Kalittokài, Paripatal)
A.D. 600 - A.D. 750

4. BAKTHI NUR KALAM
(Thevaram Prabhantham, Tirumurukarruppatai, Tiruvacakam etc.)
A.D. 600 to A.D. 900

5. NEEDHI NUR KALAM (Didactic Literature)
(Tirukkural and other kilkanakku Nulkal)
A.D. 600 - A.D. 850

6. MURKAVYA KALAM (Early Kavyas)
(Five Kavyas)
A.D. 750 - A.D. 1000

7. PIRKAVYA KALAM (Late Kavyas)
(Baratham, Ramayanam etc.)
A.D. 1100 - A.D. 1300

8. TATTUVA NURKALAM (Philosophical works)
(Meykandatevar and others).
A.D. 1000 - A.D. 1350

9. VIYAKKIYANA KALAM (Commentaries)
Ilampuranar, Peraciriyar, Perimelalakar and others.
A.D. 1200 - A.D. 1500

10. PURANA - PRABANTHA KALAM
Kumara Kuruparar, Pillai Perumal Iyengar, Sivaprakasar, Kandapuranam and others).
A.D. 1500 - A.D. 1850

11. THARKALAM (Modern)
(Ramalinga Swamikal, Navalar, Sundarampillai U.Ve. Caminatha Iyer, Bharathi and others).
A.D. 1850 - till date

13. A.C. CHETTIAR

- INTRODUCTION TO TAMIL POETRY
- Tamil Culture Vol. III, No. I, 1958

1. SANGAM LITERATURE
   B.C. 200 to A.D. 200

2. POST SANGAM LITERATURE
   A.D. 200 to A.D. 600

3. EARLY MEDIEVAL LITERATURE
   A.D. 600 to A.D. 1200

4. LATER MEDIEVAL LITERATURE
   A.D. 1200 to A.D. 1800

5. PRE-MODERN LITERATURE
   A.D. 1800 - A.D. 1900

6. MODERN LITERATURE
   A.D. 1900 to till date

14. C & H JESUDASAN

- A HISTORY OF TAMIL LITERATURE
- Calcutta - 1961

1. THE BEGINNINGS (Tolkappiam)

2. THE SANGAM PERIOD
   (A.D. 150 - A.D. 250)

3. THE POST SANGAM PERIOD
   (Kural, Cil, Mani, Kalittokai etc.)
   A.D. 250 - A.D. 600

4. THE BHAKTI MOVEMENT
   (Thevaram, Thiruvacakam, Tirumandiram, Divya Prabhandam)
   A.D. 600 - A.D. 900

5. THE AGE OF EPICS
   (Ceevaka Cintamani, Sulamani, Kamba Ramayanam, Periapuranam, Yapparungalam, Nannul, Commentaries etc.)
   A.D. 900 - A.D. 1200

6. THE DECADENT PERIOD
   (Nalavenba, Villibaradam, Sittar Poetries ...... etc.)
   A.D. 1200 - A.D. 1650

7. THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION
   (Christian Contribution, Muslim Contribution, Thayumanavar Ballads etc.)
   - A.D. 1650 - A.D. 1800

8. THE MODERN PERIOD
   (Ramalingar, Bharati, Kalki Puthumaippittan and others).
   A.D. 1800 - A.D. 1960

15. S. RAMAKRISHNAN

TAMIL ILAKKIYA VARALARU - ORU ARIMUKAM
Madras, 1962

1. SANGA KALAM (Cankam Period)
   B.C. 50 to A.D. 300

2. SANGAM MARUVIA KALAM (Post Cankam Period)

   (Tol, Kural, Cil, Mani)
   A.D. 300 to A.D. 600

3. BHAKTI NULKALIN KALAM (The age of Bhakti hymns)
   A.D. 500 to A.D. 850

4. PORKALAM (Golden Age)
   A.D. 850 to A.D. 1200

5. PIRKALAM (Later Period)
A.D. 1200 to A.D. 1800

6. THARKALAM (Modern Age)
From A.D. 1800 to till date
(Classified 20th century separately as Marumalarchi Kalam)

16. T.P.MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

A HISTORY OF TAMIL LITERATURE
- Annamalai Nagar, 1965.

1. THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE CANKAM POETS AND ITS CONTINUATION

2. THE PALLAVA PERIOD

3. THE CHOLA AGE AND ITS CONTINUATION

4. THE AGE OF FOREIGN CONTACTS AND MODERN AGE.

17. J.M.SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI

– A HISTORY OF TAMIL LITERATURE
- Annamalai Nagar, 1968

1. THE CLASSIC AGE
(Akattiam, Tolkappiyam, Tirukkural, Ettuttokai, Pattuppattu, Cil, Mani).
B.C. 400 - A.D. 300

2. THE AGE OF BUDDHISM AND JAINISM
(Cillappathikaram, Manimekalai - also Ethical Literature)
A.D. 250 - A.D. 600

18. Mu.VARADARAJAN

TAMIL ILAKKIYA VARALARU - 1972

I. PALANKALAM (Ancient Period)

(a) CANKAM LITERATURE
B.C.500 to A.D. 200

(b) NEEDHI ILLAKKIYAM (Didactic Literature)
A.D. 100 to A.D. 500

(c) PALAYA KAPPIYANKAL (Old Kavyas)
(Cil, Mani, Muttollayiram)

II. IDAIKKALAM (Medieval Period)

(a) BHAKTI LITERATURE
A.D. 600 to A.D. 900

(b) KAPPIYA ILAKKIYAM (Kavyas)
A.D. 900 to A.D. 1200
(Ceevaka Cintamani, Perunkathai etc....)

(c) URAI NULKAL (Commentaries)
A.D. 1200 - A.D. 1500

(d) PURANA ILLAKKIYAM
A.D. 1500 to A.D. 1800

III. IKKALAM (Modern Period)

(a) 19th Century
(Christian lit, Ramalingaswamigal Novels etc.)

(b) 20th Century
(Bharati, Kalki, Puthumaippittan, Short Stories, Articles, Biographies).

19. Mu.ARUNACHALAM

TAMIL ILAKKIYA VARALARU - 12th c. I BOOK - Mayuram, 1973

1. KADAI CANKATTUKKU MUNTHIA KALAM (Pre last Cankam period)
   up to 300 B.C.

2. KADAI CANKA KALAM (The period of Last Cankam)
   (Tol, Cankam lit, Tirukkural, Cil)
   B.C 300 - A.D. 250

3. KADAI CANKATTAI ADUTTA KALAM (The period Next to the Last Cankam)
   (Some of the Kilkanakku Works, Karaikkal-ammaiyar, Tirumular, First Alvar, Manimekalai)
   A.D. 250 - A.D. 600

4. PACURA KALAM (The Age of Bhakti Hymns)
   (Thevaram, Tiruvacakam, Divya Prabhandam, some of the Kilkanakku works, Perunkathai, Poetics, Kalaviyal)
   A.D. 600 - A.D. 900

5. COLAR ATIKKA KALAM (The Age of Cola Power)
   (Cintamani, Kamba Ramayanam, Periyapura-nam, Tiruvisaipa, Grammatical works and commentaries)
   A.D. 850 - A.D. 1300

6. SAMAYA ELUCHI KALAM (The period of Religious Awakening)
   (Kuru Paramparai, Saiva Sutras, Arunagirinathar)
   A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1600 (Vainava Commentaries)

7. PURANA ELUCHI KALAM
   (Saiva, Vainava Puranas, Saiva Sastra Commenta ries, Prabhandam etc.)
   A.D. 1450 - A.D. 1700

8. PIRA-NATTAR TOTARPU - (Contacts with Foreigners)
   A.D. 1700 - A.D. 1900

9. MODERN PERIOD
   After 1900 A.D.
   (a) A.D. 1900 - A.D. 1950 - (Period of Awakening)
   (b) After 1950 A.D. (The period of Servitude to America and Russia)

20. KAMIL ZVELEBIL

–TAMIL LITERATURE (In the Series Handbuch Der Orientalistik) - Leiden, 1975

A. PRE-DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE

1. THE BARDIC CORPUS:
   B.C 150 - Ca 250 A.D.
   (Cankam Literature)

2. POST CLASSICAL PERIOD
   A.D. 250 - A.D. 600
   (Cil, Mani, Kilkanakku works, Muttollayiram etc.)

B. DEVOTIONAL AND POST DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE

3. DEVOTIONAL TEXTS
   A.D. 600 - A.D. 900
   (Bhakti Literature)

POST DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE

MEDIEVAL PERIOD

4. EARLY MEDIEVAL PERIOD
   A.D. 900 - A.D. 1200
   (Pandikkovai, Nantikkalampakam, Ceevakacintamani, Neelakeci, Culamani, Perunkathai, Kamban, Tantiyalankaram, Commentators)

5. LATE MEDIEVAL PERIOD
   A.D. 1200 - A.D. 1750
   (The Philosophical and religious literature of Saiva Siddanta, and Viracivam, Vetanta Desikar, Poiyamoli Pulavar, Irattaiyar, Purattirattu, Tanippadal, tirattu, Sittar Poetries, Bhagavatapuranam, Tiruvarur Puranam, Kuravanci, Pallu, Umaru Pulavar etc.)

6. PRE MODERN LITERATURE
   A.D. 1750 - A.D. 1900

7. MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE
   - Since A.D. 1900 to till date

21. G.DEVANEYAN (PAVANAR)

TAMIL ILAKKIYA VARALARU

- N. Arcot, 1979

1. THALAIKKALAM (First Period)
   Aprox B.C. 50,000 - A.D. 1500
   (Kumari Kantam, Three Cankams etc.)

2. IDAIKKALAM (Medieval Period)
   B.C. 1500 to 18th c. A.D.
   (Comming of Aryas to India, Comming of Aryan priests to S.India - Tirumurukarruppatai, Kamba Ramayanam, Sivapprakasar, etc.

3. IKKALAM (Modern Period)
   20th c.
   (Prose Literature, non Brahman Movement, Pure Tamil Movement etc.)

22. N.SUBRAMANIAN

– AN INTRODUCTION TO TAMIL LITERATURE
- Madras, 1981

1. SANGAM AGE (Lasted nearly five centuries)
   2nd c. B.C. to 3rd c. A.D.

2. AGE OF DEVOTION
   6th c. A.D. to 10th c. A.D.

3. THE EPIC AGE (Lasted for five centuries)
   (from Kamban to Sivapprakasar, Adiveera Ramapandian etc.)
   14th c. A.D. to 16th c. A.D.

4. AGE OF CONSOLIDATION AND INTEGRATION
   17th c A.D. to 19th c. A.D.

5. AGE OF EXPERIMENTATION AND TRANSITION
   19th c. A.D.
   (From Fr. Beschi, Meenakshisundarampillai, Ramalingaswamigal, Rajam Iyer, Subramaniya Bharati .....)

VIII

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM – DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

↓

SOCIAL FORMATION

Mode of Production

Historically conditioned manner of obtaining the material goods necessary for production and for personal consumption

Social Relations

Relations established between people in the course of their joint activities

Material

Ideological

Production Relations

↓

Relations existing between people in the process of social production, exchange and distribution of material wealth

↓

SOCIAL BEING

↓

Material life of the society, production of material wealth and relations

↓

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Consciousness as production and social being views, concepts, ideas, political, legal, ethical, aesthetic theories, philosophy, morality, religion.

FORMS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

(Existing as individuated forms with (Relative autonomy) . →

- Political Ideology
- Legal concepts
- Morality
- Religion
- Science
- Philosophy
- Art & Literature

↓

(the art of words depicting man in terms of the social relations (material and ideological).

INDEX

Aeschylus 41
Agastiyar 36
Alavi, Hamza 138
Alvars 39
Andronov, M. 82
Annadurai, C.N. 69, 76
Annamalai University 72
Applied Historical Studies 11
Applied Criticism 11
Aristotle 24
Arnold Sathasivampillai 53, 58
Arumuga Navalar 51, 60
Arunachalam, M. 81, 87
Atiyarkkunallar 42
Avvai Duraiswamypillai 48
Base and superstructure 6
Basham, A.L. 81
Benjamin, W. 7
Beschi 27
Bhakthi Literature 36, 42
Breithaupt 47
Burnell, A.C. 62
Caldwell, R. 55, 62
Cankam (Sangam)
- literature 30
- compilation 31, 34
- legends 34, 36
Casie Chitty, Simon 24, 58
Chelvanayakam, V. 80, 85, 92, 94
Chelvakesavaraya Mudaliyar 54
Chengalvaraya Pillai, V.S. 59
Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar 140
Chitraleka Maunaguru 87
Christian Literature 44, 45
Cohen, Ralph 9, 17
Commentation
- their role 44, 45
Craig, David 3, 15

Dandhayutham, R. 86
De Nobli 27
De Stael 13
Desikavinayakam Pillai 72
Devapoopathi Nadarajah 86
Duraisamy Pillai, G.S. 49, 59
Ellis F.W. 47
Fabricus 47
Filliozat, J. 81
Gajabahu synchronism 67
Gough, Kathleen 114, 120122
Hart, George, L. 81
Hegel 13
Herder, J.G. 13
Ilampuranar 42
Innis 64
International Association of
Tamil Research 77
Islamic Literature 44
Jack, lan 16
Jaffna University 86
Jainism 37
Jana Sundaram 137
Jangs, Hans Robert 8
Jesudasan, C & H, 81
Justice Party 49
Kailasapathy, K. 83, 85
Kalyanasundara Mudaliyar, Tiru. V. 72
Kamaraj Nadar, K. 77
Kanakasundarampillai, T.T. 45, 48
Kanakasabhaipillai, V. 57, 138
Kanapathipillai, K. 80, 85
Kaneca Iyer 74
Karashima, Noboru 114
Kerala University 84
Kesavan, G. 137
Kindersely, N.E. 47
Knights, L.C. 4
Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, S. 60, 64
Kumaraswamy Pulavar 59

Levin, Harry 8
Literary History
- definition and scope 23
  and criticisim 11, 12
- as part of social history 14
- and Marxism 14, 15
- anti-historicism 16, 17
- past significances and present meaning 18, 31, 34
- and literary universals 19, 20
- origin of the subject 23
- and nationality consciousness 24, 25
Literature and social formation 110-16
Literary History in Tamil
- phases 26, 28
- print medium 27, 28
- politics 29
- socio-political purpose 53, 55
- psychology of the controversy in dating the texts 63-65
- University curriculum 81
- role of the universities 83, 84
- folklore studies 87
- marxist studies 87
Lukacz, G. 4
Madurai Kamaraj University 84
Mahalingam, T.V. 74
Malaysia University 86
Manickavasagar 64
Maraimalai Atikal 19, 49, 109
Marcus, Steven 16
Maria Kuringyan 137
Maxmuller 57
Mayilainathar 30
Meenakshi Sundaram, T.P. 79, 82
Metcalfe, Charles 28, 47
Mode of Production
- in 600-1200 122
- Asiatic 123
- Feudal 123-124

- in Vijayanagar rule 129
Murdoch, John 28, 59, 68
Murugadasa Swamikal 61
Naccinarkkiniyar 42
Nagasamy, R. 114
Nambiandar Nambi 39
Nathamuni 39, 40
New Criticism 15
Nilakanta Sastri 33, 57, 65, 74, 111
NonBrahmin Mutts 43
Nuhman, M.A. 87
Parimelalakar 42
Peraciriyar 30
Periodisation
- concept 115
- historiography of concept 108
- sources 116-117
Pillai, K.K. 114
Poologasingham, P. 79
Pope, Rev. 64
Problems of literary history in Tamil
- representativeness of writings 90-91
- compilation 91
- need to study
- non-literary texts 93-95
- study of religious cultures 95, 96
- writings by Tamils in other Indian languages 99
- folk studies 100
- literature and its relationship with the arts 103
- mass culture 104
- need for comunication studies 105
- language-culture and national culture 105
- dating of texts 106
Purnalingam Pillai, M.S. 54, 60, 109
Raghava Iyengar, M. 74
Raghava Iyengar, R. 72
Rajangam, D. 46

Ramachandran, T.N. 22
Ramalinga Reddi, C. 51
Ramanujam, A.K. 83
Ramasamy Naicker, E.V. 49, 70
Romila Thapar 70
Rudin 82
Sabapathy Navalar 61
Sadasiva Pandarattar 70, 84
Saiva Siddhanta
- Sociology of the doctrine 43
- compilation of the texts 42, 44
Sathianatha Iyer, R. 74
Schlegal, F 13
SelfRespect Movement 69, 73
Sesha Iyangar, T.R. 51, 53, 138
Sesha Aiyar, K.G. 56
Seshagiri Sastri, M. 67
Shakespeare 41
Shanmugam Pillai, M. 85
Singaravelu, S. 86
Singer, Milton 90
Sivathamby, K. 83, 85, 139
Social formation in Tamilnadu 112-114
Somasundara Bharathiyar 72, 73
Srinivasa Iyengar, P.T. 139
Srinivasa Iyengar, M. 46, 138
Srinivasa Pillai, K.S. 60
Stein, B. 114, 124130
Subbarayalu, Y. 114
Subramania Sastri, P.S. 75
Subramanian, N. 83
Subramania Iyer, A.V. 39
Subramaniapillai, K. 29
Subramoniam, V.I. 79
Sundaram, Rm. 33
Sundarampillai 53, 63
Swaminatha Iyer, R. 67
Taine 13
Tamil as example of non-Aryan
Indian Culture 76

Tamil Awakening 50, 51
Temples 37, 38
Thamotherampillai, C.W. 56
Thamu Ammal, T.N. 74
Thaninayagam, X.S. 83
The South Indian Saiva Siddhanta Works
  Publishing Society 75
Thillainathan, S. 85
Tirugnanasambandhar 62, 63
Tolkappiyam 59
Umapati Civacariyar 42
Vaiyapuripillai, S. 61, 71, 78, 80, 109
Valentijin 46
Vansina, Jan 32
Varadaraja Iyer, C.S. 84
Vellaivaranar, K. 84
Veluppillai, A. 85
Venkatarama Sastry, T.R. 50
Venkatacamy, Mylai Ceeni 64, 74
Vithiananthan, S. 85
Warren, Austin 139
Wellek, Rene 14, 23, 58
Western interest in Tamil Studies 77, 81
Williams, Raymond 7
Zieganbalg, 47
Zvelebil, Kamil 32, 82